

JPRS-UKO-85-001

15 January 1985

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 14, September 1984

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

15 January 1985

## USSR REPORT

### TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 14, September 1984

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

### CONTENTS

To Assert the Truth of Life, the Lofty Ideals of Socialism (K. U. Chernenko) .....	1
Let Us Know and Understand Each Other Well (K. U. Chernenko) .....	10
K. U. Chernenko's Address to Finnish TV Viewers .....	12
Castles in the Air or Scientifically Substantiated Goal? (V. Golobokov) .....	14
National Labor Potential: How To Use It More Effectively (L. Kunel'skiy) .....	28
Developing the Domestic Export Potential (N. Smelyakov) .....	41
Stalwart Soldier of Lenin's Guard (M. Smirnov) .....	52
Our Republic Is a State of Peace and Socialism (Erich Honecker) .....	64
KOMMUNIST on USSR-GDR Economic Cooperation (L. Kostandov) .....	74
Structural Crisis and Sociopolitical Polarization in the Capitalist World (V. Kuvaldin) .....	85

Propaganda Myths and Hard Facts (Vl. Afanas'yev, R. Dzarasov) .....	100
Loyalty to the Leninist Banner (A. Yakovlev) .....	110
Self-Awareness of Science (G. Smirnov) .....	120
Dialectics and Logic of Historical Materialism (A. Kharchev) .....	129
Aid to Sociologists (M. Mitin) .....	142
Strange Position (Ye. Bugayev) .....	145
Imperialist Psychological Warfare (Yu. Kirshin) .....	158
Bookshelf .....	161
JPRS Index .....	163



PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 14  
September 1984

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : September 1984

Signed to press : 28 Sep 84

Copies : 902,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",  
"Kommunist", 1984

TO ASSERT THE TRUTH OF LIFE, THE LOFTY IDEALS OF SOCIALISM

LD250835 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84)  
pp 3-11

[Speech by K. U. Chernenko at the anniversary plenum of the Board of the USSR Writers' Union on 25 September 1984]

[Text] Dear Comrades:

Your plenary meeting is devoted to the 50th anniversary of a signal event in the history of Soviet culture--the first All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers. Today, we look with pride at the path covered by Soviet literature born of the Great October Revolution, a literature which vividly reflects revolutionary changes of the 20th century (applause).

This is a literature which lives the lives of the people, the party and the country. It graphically portrays the outstanding personalities of Lenin and his associates, heroes of the Civil War and 1st Five-Year Plan periods, immortal soldiers of the Great Patriotic War. This is a literature in the center of which is man of work and man at work, a keen, searching and active builder of socialism. This is a literature which can understand and depict its contemporary in the entire complexity of his inner world and moral quest, in his joys and anxieties, in his striving for truth and justice.

The cause, started so remarkably by Gorky, Mayakovskiy, Fadeyev and Sholokhov, is being continued today by writers and poets who actively and fruitfully work in our multinational literature (applause). I will not, of course, mention here names or specific works.

I will note only that new, ingenious and profound works that have emerged in literature in the past years, works that move the Soviet leader, compel him to ponder and argue, are the most correct evidence of the fact that we are witnessing how works that will withstand the test of time and truthfully tell our offspring about this time are entering Soviet and, indeed, world classical literature.

I will not, probably, make a mistake by saying that the real extent of influence exerted by literature and art on the whole on the molding of the ideological and moral frame of mind of the people is the most precise criterion of their successes. In this sense, Soviet literature is indeed

unmatched. It embodies the spiritual wealth of the new, socialist civilization. That is why the party, the people regard with so great respect the noble work of writers, all workers in art (applause).

Comrades, the anniversary of the First Writers' Congress is conducive to a frank, thorough talk not only on the state of affairs in literature, but also on the problems of artistic work in general, on the place of art in our life. I believe that you, workers in Soviet art, have a need for a talk of this kind. I am sure that tens of millions of your readers, viewers and listeners, in brief, the whole of our society, are also interested in this. Frankly speaking, I too would like to take part in this talk. Speaking about problems of artistic work, I am not, naturally, going to give you recipes on how to resolve them. I would like to speak my mind above all on political aspects of these problems, to share with you my concerns and tell you about the vital tasks of party policy today, about our understanding of them and about our actions.

Problems of artistic endeavor do not exist outside politics. This is an obvious truth for us. But, as is known, it is with difficulty that this truth has made its way. One can hardly overestimate the contribution made to its principled assertion by the First Writers' Congress.

That congress dealt with the mission of literature in socialist society, with its role in bringing up a new man, with the civic duty of a literary worker. Aleksey Maksimovich Gorky's attitude to these issues was a broad, Leninist one. You remember, of course, his main idea that the writer must learn to use actively the great right granted by socialism. This is the right to directly take part in building the new life, to be a strict judge of all things inert and obsolete and to assert by his art true humanism and the lofty ideals of socialism. Such is, in fact, the political meaning of socialist realism--the chief artistic methods of our literature and art.

The first congress became a turning point in the process of the establishment of literature of a new, socialist direction. It did not start from a blank page, so to say, but grew on the foundation of frontranking Russian literature, the democratic culture of all peoples of Russia and the world classical heritage.

Summing up the congress's work, Gorky assessed it as a victory of bolshevism. He was undoubtedly right: The introduction of communist party commitment and organization into literature helped it to become, as envisioned by Lenin, really free, openly connected with the working man. The organizational form of uniting literary workers, found after a long search and endorsed at the congress, was adopted by masters of other arts. And it has withstood the test of time.

The importance of the first congress, however, exceeded the framework of artistic life: It became a landmark in the history of the establishment of Soviet intelligentsia. Recall: Two-thirds of the congress delegates were of worker and peasant origin. In other words, they were first-generation intellectuals. This fact proved better than any words that a new intelligentsia was born and occupied a worthy place in our society.



The congress of literary workers consolidated the alliance between work and culture that had been established after the October Revolution. Without this union, without the union of workers, peasants and intellectuals, the cementing force of which was and remains the working class, a successful construction of socialism is simply impossible. This was true half a century ago. This is even more accurate today, when the intelligentsia is no longer a narrow segment of educated persons, but a powerful stratum of the working people. And its contribution to our common cause--perfecting socialism built in the USSR--is steadily growing.

This is, of course, a complicated business. It does not tolerate a lightminded, simplistic attitude. One has to think twice, as the saying goes. And that is precisely so. We demand today that even machines be clever. Although this is just a metaphor, it aptly underlines the peculiarity of the present-day production process--its growing intellectual intensity. It is no accident that we closely link the rise in the efficiency of the national economy and intensification of production with an accelerated application of scientific discoveries and achievements in engineering, and, of course, with the restructuring of economic thinking itself.

Generally speaking, comrades, we cannot advance successfully in any sphere of party, state and economic work without reliance on the profound knowledge, the high consciousness and culture of all working people, on the immense spiritual, creative potential accumulated by generations of Soviet people. The decisions of the 26th Congress and recent Central Committee plenums are directed, as a matter of fact, at a complete mobilization of this potential. We are convinced that this can impart powerful acceleration to our entire development.

Representatives of professions, traditionally described as creative intelligentsia, have gathered in this hall. I think that you will back me if I say that a creative character of work, creative attitude to one's line of work, should become today a distinguishing feature of every member of the intelligentsia--scientist or engineer, teacher or doctor. This equally applies, naturally, to every factory worker and collective farmer, to all who honestly and conscientiously work in the name of the prosperity of our great motherland. There are millions upon millions of such people in our country.

You have probably already noticed, comrades, that I want to lead you to the thought that the very nature of the tasks facing our society opens a really limitless opportunity for the application of the creative forces and energy of all segments of the Soviet intelligentsia. Forms and directions of their activity are exceptionally diverse. But there is something which unites them. I have in mind the immense influence which the intelligentsia exerts on public consciousness, on the spiritual life of society. One should always take this into account in the party's policy, in its ideological and organizational work, as Lenin taught. This is especially important during periods when society finds itself face to face with qualitatively new tasks to solve which a new level of public consciousness, naturally, is required.

The present-day situation is precisely the same. The party's theoretical thought has equipped us with a concept of developed socialism. The strength



of this concept is that it makes it possible to clearly define the degree of social and economic maturity achieved by the new society, to envision more clearly our immediate and distant objectives. This may seem somewhat abstract at first sight. But, pondering it and carefully studying party documents, one cannot fail to note that the points at issue are very specific and vital things: the need to assess thoroughly and realistically the peculiarities of the current period, allowing neither the belittling of our great and undeniable achievements, nor the embellishment of reality or the dramatization of shortcomings. This also applies to the importance of creative search for new ways of resolving outstanding tasks consistent with these peculiarities.

Incidentally, if a short definition of the essence of this approach were to be required, we would probably use the words familiar to you--socialist realism.

At present, literature, cinema and theater not infrequently turn to complex, contradictory phenomena. This is not surprising. Contradictions are natural and inevitable in the development of socialist society. They naturally affect destinies of people one way or another or become a source of moral collisions. The more so since overcoming these contradictions, although they are not antagonistic in our country, requires considerable effort, great civic courage and principle-mindedness. This offers the writer a wealth of material for thinking, for fulfilling the eternal mission of literature--to induce society and every person to take a more critical look at himself in order to help him to take, always and under all circumstances, the active position of a steadfast fighter for our common cause.

In helping the party to educate people in a communist spirit and mold a truly Soviet character, our literature and art have done much to reveal the essence of this character, to create truthful, full-blooded characters of men and women selflessly devoted to the people, to socialism, symbolizing the heroic construction of a new world. We all understand that it is not easy to do this, to transfer such people from life into a work of art. This is why, probably, a debate within the artistic circles about the positive character is natural and necessary. Of course, I am not going to interfere in it. I would like to state only one opinion. It seems to me that the debate on the "doses" of positive and negative traits in the character is rather unproductive. What is important, comrades, is that the artistic quests have, if I may put it this way, a single starting point--faithfulness to the truth of life, to socialist ideals. This is a necessary condition of the party commitment, the grassroots character of art.

A reader, a viewer, especially a young one, of course, would like to meet in the book or on the screen a believable contemporary, whom he could love, whom he would like to emulate. I am repeating what I said at the June Plenum of the Central Committee, since I am convinced that nothing can replace literature and art in shaping social mores and people's feelings and in their ability to influence the mind and the heart.

In this connection, I would like to mention one more thing. Drawing people into artistic culture and aesthetic education yields firm results when they start from an early age. It is an undeniable merit of our school that we have virtually no ignoramuses. Regrettably, we still do meet youngsters who are

infantile emotionally and psychologically. We should, probably, use the school reform to enhance the influence of literature and art on the molding of the personality. I am convinced that ideological and moral development of the rising generations and the molding of the standard of emotions should receive no less attention than training in the fundamentals of sciences. The party relies on the specific help of artistic unions, our artistic intelligentsia here.

Education through history was and remains an important instrument in inculcating civic duty, Soviet patriotism and internationalism. It is a positive element that the historical theme is undergoing a kind of renaissance in literature, in art. The ability to talk about the past in a serious, considered manner, from the position of the Marxist-Leninist outlook, is what brings success in this undertaking, as practice shows. Neither rewriting of history nor its embellishment are allowed. The artistic representation of the history of the Soviet people's struggle for socialism calls for a particularly thoughtful and a truly class approach. In order not to become at odds with truth, the artist must firmly rely on facts and not replace the knowledge of the laws and of the real course of social development by emotions and arbitrary play of imagination.

It is encouraging that Soviet artists have started to turn to publicistic writing. This enables them to intrude boldly and in a timely way into most topical problems, into concrete economic and social issues which concern people. This helps the creation of such works which, through art, often outstrip time, accentuating urgent vital problems and offering specific ways for their solution.

In brief, comrades, whatever subject--contemporary or historical, domestic or international--the artist might be handling, whatever genre he might be using, the social value of his work is determined first of all by the active ideological and political stance and world outlook that he holds and asserts.

Comrades, the international situation influences to a great extent the pace of our advancement. It is disquieting at present. I have spoken on several occasions about this lately. So, let me touch only some issues.

The grim truth of the present international situation is such that the nuclear threat is, regrettably, great. One cannot hide from it, nor turn it into a joke. One has to fight the nuclear threat vigorously and purposefully. That is precisely what we are doing.

This determines above all also our attitude concerning relations with the United States, for the state of these relations determines to a considerable extent the state of affairs in the international arena. But they in the United States, as all signs indicate, either do not want, or are not yet ready to understand that there is no sensible alternative to the normalization of Soviet-American relations on the principles of equality, mutual respect and non-interference in the internal affairs of each other.

It is a huge burden nowadays to possess a powerful nuclear potential, not to mention its costliness. I refer to the burden of colossal responsibility

which rests on political figures, demanding that they display a most serious attitude to issues of war and peace, to conflict situations. It is from this that we proceed. Our objectives are clear and unchanged: We are categorically opposed to confrontation in the military sphere. We are resolutely in favor of a radical limitation and reduction of the arms race, prohibition and total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Millions upon millions of people abroad, while subscribing to different views and convictions, are striving to achieve the same goals. Their concerted effort exerts a noticeable influence on the shaping of antiwar public opinion. This is very important, comrades. The intelligentsia, the workers in culture can do much. That is why Gorky's famous question-appeal "Whose side are you on, masters of culture?" rings with such great alarm and insistence today. The matter, of course, does not boil down to a choice between the USSR and the United States as anticommunists not infrequently claim. It is a matter of choice between the life and death of our civilization. There is no "golden middle" here: One can be either with those who are preparing for war or with those who reject imperialism's adventurous policy, who work for peaceful coexistence, for disarmament.

That is why it is so important that our artistic intelligentsia help their foreign colleagues make such a choice. This is, by the way, what ruling circles in the West fear so much. They are seeking to discredit the ideas and practice of socialism in the eyes of intellectuals in their own countries and set them against the artistic intelligentsia in socialist states. The enemies of peace fear the unity of the masters of culture whose voice is heeded by millions of people.

People in the West, meanwhile, like to talk about the benefits of comparing ideas and views and developing contacts between people. We, of course, favor this. But what do we encounter in practice? Attempts at uncerecermonious interference in our domestic affairs, a real psychological war. And one of its aims is to undermine, if only a little, the unity between workers in our culture and the party.

As you know, they resort to methods that are not in the least intellectual, to put it bluntly--lies, manipulation of facts and substitution of notions. They claim, for instance, that socialism "does not tolerate" freedom of creative work and that the CPSU creates obstacles in the way of artistic quest, that it demands "uniformity" in literature and art. Everything in these claims is turned upside down. This is not due to ignorance, naturally. It is a futile undertaking, of course, to persuade our ideological opponents to change their minds. But it is necessary to tirelessly uphold and explain our views, to expose dishonest "critics" of the new system and actively to bring home to people the truth about socialism and to educate Soviet people, especially the youth, in the spirit of class vigilance and readiness for defense of our great motherland.

There is another point I would like to mention. We hope that during the period of preparations for the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War the leadership of artistic unions and organizations will find it possible to draw the even keener



attention of the masters of art to the military-patriotic theme. At present we cannot complain that there are few works on this subject which has long occupied a worthy place in the activity of our workers of culture. But one would like more of such works to become a true event in the country's artistic life, in the development of Soviet literature and art.

Comrades, our party and state are creating conditions which help people reveal their full talent and to work for the benefit of the nation. We resolutely reject petty patronage over people engaged in creative work. Creative activity is creative because it is free: Nothing really new and beautiful can come off under compulsion. This truth is old and proving it is like knocking at an open door.

The freedom of creative work, however, is not a privilege for a few. The party treats talent with consideration and regards it as the most valuable asset of society. But nothing and no one can free a person from the compulsory demands of society and its laws that are obligatory for all. It is naive to think that one can blacken the moral and political foundations of our system and expect simultaneously benefits and recognition from it. And, of course, the people will not forgive anyone's defection to the side of our ideological opponents in the keen struggle currently under way in the world. There can be no two views on this account.

Well, comrades, many absurdities and utter nonsense have been written and spoken in the West for the sake of distorting the very essence of the party's approach to art. Sometimes it happens like this: They take a not very successful work by a Soviet author, who replaces an artistic study of life by declaratory sentences. Then they start convincing all and sundry: This is the standard which the CPSU strives to impose. A powerful, profound book, written from party positions, is described by them as "deviation" from the norm. I think that you will allow me not to mention specific examples: Some of the comrades sitting in the hall have been victims of such manipulations.

Profound ideological content, civic spirit and high level of artistic skill--such is the chief demand of the party and the people to workers in the arts. The decisions of the June (1983) Central Committee Plenum and several recent resolutions on questions of culture, known to you, lead our artistic intelligentsia precisely in this direction.

Our great cause, our humanistic goals, do not need heartless eulogizing in rhyme and prose. Works in which original and fresh thought is replaced, as Schedrin ironically observed, by "callous repetition of truisms," can only jokingly be described as works of art. Badly written books and operas, primitive feature films and television series, tastelessly made sculptures and canvases not only spoil the taste of millions of people, they discredit the subjects and ideas which their makers tried to address. Naturally, no indulgence should be shown towards lack of ideological content or towards an indiscriminating world outlook.

By the way, comrades, is not the trouble with some of our art critics that they adopt a one-sided attitude, and either heap compliments on a weak novel,



play or film referring to the "importance of the subject," or take delight in the "aesthetic findings" of an ideologically unsound work?

Meanwhile, our and world experience show that great literature and great art cannot exist without highly professional critique possessing civic responsibility. This means that our Marxist-Leninist critique should not only give an accurate assessment of works. We expect more from art critics: ability to reveal the profound social essence of problems handled in works, back the authors if they raise them correctly and argue logically with them when they are mistaken. In brief, our critique should help the advancement of the people's spiritual life. That is why, as Lenin believed, it is necessary "to link literary criticism closer with party work" (op. cit., vol 47, p 134).

Everybody whom the party entrusted with the task of pursuing the Leninist line in the arts should do this intelligently and with initiative. This means conducting a frank and principled dialogue with people engaged in creative work. They should in no way avoid discussing acute problems of concern to artists. They should not refer their solution to the so-called higher bodies of authority, but be able to persuade and, if necessary, to convince the interlocutor to change his mind. Party guidance of literature and art is unthinkable without that. This is precisely what makes it, as Gorky aptly said, "a morally authoritative force."

Comrades, communist party members constitute the political nucleus, the uniting force of artistic unions. They are called upon to assert the spirit of party commitment in artistic circles, actively influence the ideological direction of creative work, facilitate the shaping of Marxist-Leninist outlook among workers of literature and art and help the molding of artistic youth. Of particular importance is the consolidation of an atmosphere of strictness and exactingness of artists towards one another. This benefits not only the artists but art on the whole.

Soviet culture today constitutes an organic blend of spiritual values that are being created by all nations and peoples of the country. Therefore, we can fully understand the inclination of the writer, artist, musician and architect to rely on centuries-old cultural traditions of his people, to give a profound and graphic depiction of his republic's life. Artistic practice proves at the same time that the closer national culture is connected with others and the more intensively it absorbs the features of the spiritual and artistic experience of fraternal peoples, which have acquired international importance, then the more quickly and fruitfully it develops and the greater the contribution it makes to the enrichment of the spiritual life of all Soviet people, the whole of our society.

Dear comrades, before completing my speech, I would like to tell you the news which will undoubtedly gladden you all. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has awarded the Order of Peoples' Friendship to the USSR Union of Writers for services in developing Soviet literature, for the major contribution by Soviet writers to communist construction and in connection with the 50th anniversary of its foundation (tempestuous sustained applause).

Now let me wish you all good health, successes in creative work and present Writers' Union with this high, well-deserved decoration.

(All stand up to tempestuous sustained applause. Comrade K. U. Chernenko pinned the Order of the Peoples' Friendship on the banner of the USSR Union of Writers.)

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/2

LET US KNOW AND UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER WELL

LD101333 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14 Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84)  
pp 12-13

[Preface to K. U. Chernenko's Book of Speeches and Articles published by the Portuguese Avante! Publishing House]

[Text] It is with pleasure that I am fulfilling the request of the Avante! Publishing House to write a small forward to this book.

Soviet people have always respected the Portuguese people and its glorious traditions of struggle for its freedom and independence and against reaction and fascism.

Your glorious revolution of April 1974, that put an end to the dictatorial regime, was ardently welcomed in the Soviet Union. Having unfettered the tremendous forces with which the popular masses are so richly endowed, it created the possibility of carrying out important social changes in the life of the people of Portugal. Today Soviet people express feelings of invariable solidarity with those who in your country are struggling for the preservation of revolutionary gains, for the vital interests of working people and for national independence.

The establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Portugal and the conclusion of agreements on questions of economy, culture and science were some of the results of the revolution. At the time Soviet-Portuguese cooperation became one of the elements of detente. Today too we want the utmost development of equal, mutually advantageous Soviet-Portuguese ties, the expansion and strengthening of friendship between our peoples. On our part we are prepared for constructive cooperation.

Such cooperation acquires special significance in the situation when mankind is in the grips of concern for its future in connection with the threat of nuclear war. This concern is well-founded--the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe is continuing, the geography of the deployment and transportation of United States nuclear arms is expanding and foreign territories are being increasingly used by the American militarists as bases for hostile and aggressive actions against other peoples.

But any action, as is known, causes counteraction. In reply to the militaristic, aggressive actions of the United States, pursuing the aim of wrecking the existing military-strategic balance, we are compelled to take our own defensive measures. The Soviet people have not forgotten how in June 1941 fascist Germany made use of its temporary superiority and perfidiously attacked the USSR. The Second World War cost Soviet people 20 million lives and we do not want to suffer again from any aggressor whatsoever.

As to our love of peace, it has a realistic basis: A people which has experienced the horrors of bombing, the death of relatives and comrades, and lived through the privations of long war years cannot harbor plans of unleashing a world conflict. In the USSR there are no classes or social strata that would be interested in wars, in making profits on the arms race.

I can say with full responsibility for my words that the Soviet Union was, is and will be a champion of solving all complex international problems by way of talks. As different from those for whom talks are only a diverting maneuver, an object for manipulating public opinion, we stand for businesslike, honest talks which would lead to a termination of the arms race, to a reduction of nuclear arsenals up to and including the total destruction of these weapons.

The Soviet people value peace also because it makes it possible to implement the plans we have of further developing our wonderful country.

We are proud of the results of society's transformation on the roads of socialism. We do not have exploitation of man by man, we do not have either social or national oppression. For more than 50 years already there has been no unemployment in the USSR. The population is provided with free medical services and illiteracy has been stamped out. The Soviet Union is a land of genuine power of the people in which the working people administer the socialist state and the work collective is the basic cell of society.

In short, no capitalist country can boast what Soviet people have achieved. At the same time we are far from self-complacency: Much is yet to be done, perfected and improved. Our party, government, public organizations, the Soviet people are working hard on this.

Our successes and difficulties, the main problems of our foreign and home policy--you will read about this in the book that is being offered to you.

In the world of today it is very important to know and to understand each other well. That is why I would like to hope that on the following pages you will find answers to many of your questions concerning my country which, as a result, will become closer and more understandable to you.

I wish you well-being, peace and happiness, Portuguese readers.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/02



**K. U. CHERNENKO'S ADDRESS TO FINNISH TV VIEWERS**

LD211729 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84)  
p 14

[Text] Dear friends and neighbors:

Forty years ago, in September 1944, an armistice agreement was signed with Finland. The peoples of our two countries embarked on the road of peace and good neighborliness, the road which had been consistently advocated by the Soviet state ever since Lenin's decree on the recognition of the state independence of Finland.

We can say today that friendship, mutual trust and fruitful cooperation have become the essence of Soviet-Finnish relations. They were and remain immune to the vagaries of the world political climate.

Why is it so? Because our good neighborliness reflects every advantage of the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. We are building our relationships on lasting, principled and solid factors. Our good partnership is dependably guaranteed by the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance. Recently we extended it, this time to the beginning of the next millennium.

Similarly dependable guarantees are provided by political understanding between state leaders of the two countries and by the broad support enjoyed by the course of friendship between the Soviet and Finnish peoples.

The Soviet Union appreciates the fact that the strengthening of friendship and cooperation with our country constitutes, as you say, the centerpiece of Finland's foreign policy course, the course which was formulated by such outstanding statesmen as President Paasikivi, President Kekkonen and now President Koivisto.

I can assure you that the Soviet Union will consistently and unflaggingly pursue the policy of good neighborliness with your country, bequeathed us by the founder of the Soviet state, Vladimir I'lich Lenin.

We greatly appreciate the contribution made to our common cause by the Finland-Soviet Union Society established 40 years ago. Its activity, just as the work done by the USSR-Finland Society, helps to tackle the most important

task, that of ensuring that the new generations, born after the war, consciously and energetically carry on the cause of those who laid the foundations of Soviet-Finnish good neighborliness.

You and we have accumulated invaluable capital of friendship and mutually beneficial cooperation. May this wealth amassed by our countries jointly in the course of their long efforts and honest and equal dialogue be augmented in future. It is my conviction that the world community would benefit a great deal if relations between all states were built in the same spirit.

Dear friends, I happened to visit your hospitable country during the work of the historic European conference. Even during those few days I became aware of the cordiality with which the Finns regard our country. I assure you that the Soviet people entertain similar sentiments for Finland.

I wish with all my heart our good neighbors, the people of Finland, peace and prosperity, success and happiness.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/2

## CASTLES IN THE AIR OR SCIENTIFICALLY SUBSTANTIATED GOAL?

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 15-26

[Article by V. Golobokov on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of the publication of V. I. Lenin's work "Who Are Those 'Friends of the People' and How Do They Struggle Against the Social Democrats?"]

[Text] Ninety years ago N. K. Mikhaylovskiy, the leader of the liberal populists, who had proclaimed in the journal RUSSKOYE BOGATSTVO a campaign against Marxism, deemed it necessary to apologize to his readers for having paid great attention to criticizing a literary trend virtually unknown at that time. Other more important phenomena in literature and life, he condescendingly said, will be always with us and why be bored while satisfying the interests of a relatively small circle of readers?

What was the more important feature hiding behind this statement? Was it flirtatiousness or a vague concern in the face of "some of our successors in the field of life" (as N. K. Mikhaylovskiy described the Marxists)? Hard to say. Most likely, it was a combination of both.

Flirtatiousness was an inseparable feature in the writings of the liberal populists, who were trying to conceal behind luxuriant phraseology the barrenness of their social ideal, the futurelessness of their cause and fear of the realities of life. Inner concern of the growing, the terrifying force of the labor movement, the ideological expression of which Leninism was soon to become, was clearly apparent through all their idle talk. It was precisely the influence of this force, which was becoming increasingly tangible, including among the "reading public." Subsequently, in 1907, Lenin described his polemics with the old populist leadership (N. K. Mikhaylovskiy above all) as the "threshold of the upsurge of the mass labor movement in Russia" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 16, p 95).

It was a threshold rather than a premonition or even a prediction. The 24-year-old Marxist, Vladimir Ul'yanov did not only anticipate the revolutionary era of the proletariat but was already doing everything possible to bring it closer. He was a most energetic participant in its progress. He spent the beginning of the 1900s in active efforts to rally the scattered revolutionary circles, which was completed with the creation of the "Alliance in the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class," founded in Petersburg in

1895. It was the prototype of a party of a new, Leninist type. The most important structural component of such activities was the formulation of a program and of the objectives of the labor movement, the only one around which the progressive revolutionary detachments could rally within the party. Lenin's first printed article (works he had written earlier were published much later) was aimed above all at resolving this problem. He used his clash with the liberal populists to this effect. N. K. Krupskaya wrote that "the objective of the struggle was formulated with exceptional clarity in 'Who Are Those 'Friends of the People' and How Do They Struggle Against the Social Democrats?'"

A premonition of the incoming proletarian era was inherent more in the liberal populists, for it was precisely their vague feeling of the advent of a new revolutionary force that led them to oppose it in the open press, i.e., in the press allowed by the tsarist censorship, amending their usual ostrich-like policy of hiding from acute vital problems. They acted and were defeated, for there was no way--either theoretically or, even less so, by promoting practical objectives, they could counter the iron logic of Lenin's thinking, a logic which seemed to embody the irreversible gait of the attacking proletariat.

What could the liberal populists oppose it with, if reality itself had debunked their theoretical fiction! It had become impossible to deny that by the end of the 19th century Russia was following the path of capitalist development. However, as before, the liberal populists continued to reject this. Their position was one more confirmation of the truth that obsolete views do not leave the historical stage by themselves and that if life refutes them, in the opinion of their supporters, this changes absolutely nothing: they proclaim in the face of its horrifying unseemliness the "ideal" of what is necessary, a type of life system consistent with human nature.

Pitting the "world of what must be against the world of reality"--the inseparable feature of any utopianism--became at that time the banner of the struggle which the liberal populists waged against Marxism. In their view, let the Marxists praise the existence of causality and the universal laws of history. Scientifically, however, they have not proved this at all. The nature of the course of history is, generally speaking, undetectable. Nor can it be detected through materialism. The supporters of the Marxist doctrine had not even defined the meaning of society, progress, etc. If one could accept Marx's "Das Kapital" as a scientific study, it was a study of a single period in European life rather than the entire history of mankind. The method used in this work was somewhat Hegelian. It was a triad: thesis, antithesis and synthesis. The imposition of this triad on reality led to the historical pattern praised by the Marxists!

It is hard to believe that such "arguments" were voiced nearly a century ago, for to this day they appear in the views of some "critics" of Marxism. Today as well we find a strong aspiration on the part of our ideological foes to present their wishes as reality, to vulgarize Marxism and thus to create a parody of Marxism itself.



"Yes," Lenin agrees, "Marx studied in detail a single socioeconomic system--capitalism. However, it is precisely that which makes his approach scientific." To begin with the question of what is society and what is progress means to start from the end," Lenin objected. "How can you develop a concept of society and progress in general without having studied a single social system and been unable even to formulate this concept or to approach the serious factual study, the objective analysis of any social relation whatsoever?" (op. cit., vol 1, p 141).

How was the concept of socioeconomic system developed by Marx? By a reinterpretation of history from the positions of dialectical materialism, on the basis of the critical reworking of the spiritual legacy of the past, the philosophical above all, both materialistic and idealistic. This allowed Marx and Engels, from the very first decade of their activities, to formulate a materialistic view on the development of society, according to which history is not a single flow of events and phenomena but a legitimate change of qualitatively defined systems and entities--socioeconomic systems. "It has never happened nor does it exist today," Lenin wrote, "for the members of a society to represent a sum total of social relations in which they live as something determined, integral, imbued by some kind of principle..." (op. cit., vol 1, p 136).

The determination of a single principle, which ran through the entire social fabric, also made it possible to surmount the roots of any subjectivism in sociology--the inability to distinguish between important and unimportant factors in the complex fabric of social phenomena. Marx's materialism, Lenin emphasized, provided an entirely objective criterion for making such a distinction by singling out production relations as the structure of society (ibid. p 137).

To this day we run across the view that in his polemics with N. K. Mikhaylovskiy Lenin displayed a negative attitude toward general concepts and summarizing views. It is usually said in this case that knowledge must proceed from the study of facts, their gathering and comparison and only then undertake the development of theory. The result is that with the appearance of any new object in the realm of human knowledge the researcher must start from scratch. We could agree with this providing that the newly appeared object is absolutely new, based on nothing, placed as though outside time and space. Such objects exist only in the realm of abstraction, where no social system is to be found. A new social system not only appears on the records of the old. It is not only created from previous systems but is also the result of the entire preceding development of society, retaining within it the main features of this development in a reorganized manner. That is why the science which studies this new object is also the result of previous scientific developments or, more precisely, the result of their critical reworking. It is precisely such reworking that creates prerequisites for a theoretical approach to the interpretation of empirical data and enables us not to become mired in the abundance of facts. Although facts themselves play the role of a prime source of knowledge, their study and understanding require prerequisites of a theoretical nature. It was on the basis of the shaped materialistic outlook of history by Marx and Engels in the period which preceded the writing of "Das Kapital" that Lenin discovered the significance of the general

formulation of a scientific problem and of the initial hypothesis in its study. In other words, Lenin was able to substantiate what Engels formulated concisely: "Like any new theory, socialism should proceed above all from the ideological material accumulated prior to it, although its roots are sunk deeply into material economic facts" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 19, p 189).

Yet Lenin did show a negative attitude toward general concepts and views. However, this applied to concepts and views which were aimed not at the scientific study of reality but at drawing away from reality. Mikhaylovskiy, Lenin ironically points out, would like "to encompass all periods in such a way as to avoid discussing any one of them in particular. Understandably, the only way to achieve this objective, i.e., to encompass all periods without dealing essentially with any one of them, is to speak in generalities and use 'brilliant' and meaningless terms" (op. cit., vol 1, p 148). If history is considered as a simple total of events and phenomena, the overall view on history is shaped on the basis of singling out characteristics inherent in all of them. The purpose of the "study" in this case is to find this characteristic in one historical phenomenon or another rather than to study the latter by itself. It is with the help of such summations that the concepts of progress, development and so on have been created which, naturally, could not fail to be criticized by Lenin.

Naturally, general concepts as well provide a certain idea of social life or, rather, of some of its general features. However, the determination of such features, characteristics, and so on, does not mean in itself an understanding of this life itself or even of one of its historically determined development stages. The general is merely an element of the specific, an inner aspect of its dynamics, rather than its own concreteness. Consequently, singling out such general features and characteristics cannot be the aim of the social sciences although, unfortunately, such a concept is occasionally expressed to this day.

The view of history as a natural historical process, as a legitimate change of socioeconomic systems remains hypothetical until even a single one of them has been studied in detail. "In itself the idea of materialism in sociology," Lenin points out, "was brilliant. Naturally, this was then no more than a hypothesis, but a hypothesis which for the first time offered the possibility of establishing a strictly scientific attitude toward historical and social problems" (ibid., p 136). It was Marx himself who achieved this "strictly scientific attitude toward social problems" in "Das Kapital".

The study of the bourgeois production method made by Marx yielded brilliant results. This was confirmed, in addition to everything else, also by the fact that the liberal populists (and not only they) were unable to formulate anything pertaining to the problems raised in this classical Marxist work. Their criticism was not aimed at analyzing basic concepts, proofs and conclusions contained in "Das Kapital." Its purpose was different: without affecting the essence of the matter, to try to limit such conclusions, and to reduce their significance and role in the understanding of reality and the trends which gave a view of the future. Actually, nothing else was possible, for the theory developed in "Das Kapital" was so convincing that even its

opponents questioned not its accuracy per se but its applicability to Russian conditions. "...To the Russian socialist," Lenin pointed out, "almost immediately after the appearance of 'Das Kapital' the main theoretical problem was that of the 'fate of capitalism in Russia'; this was the question around which the most heated arguments were concentrated and the most important programmatic concepts were resolved accordingly" (ibid., p 275).

The efforts of the bourgeois ideologues and revisionists to limit the significance of Marxist basic conclusions contained in "Das Kapital" through temporal frameworks or territorial and national boundaries and to the European area, are still popular. As a rule, on the basis of the first limitation, the conclusion is drawn of the obsolescence of Marxism as such; the second is used as an argument of the inapplicability of its basic conclusions and methodology to other non-European countries and to new circumstances. Although such "criticism" of Marxism is differently packaged today and comes in a great variety of forms, its objective remains unchanged: without affecting the essence of the matter to depreciate, to narrow, to emasculate and to neutralize the basic scientific concepts of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Marx's detailed study of the bourgeois production method was a study not only of the economy of a single historical period. It depicted a historically defined socioeconomic system in its integrity. It established the laws governing its appearance, development and need for its replacement with a higher social system. The scientific significance of a work such as "Das Kapital," Lenin emphasized, "consists of the clarification of the specific (historical) laws which regulate the appearance, existence, development and death of a specific social organism, replaced by another, a superior organism" (ibid., p 167).

Characteristic of society as a specific integrity is, above all, an inner interconnection, a unity of all its aspects, determined and reproduced by the dynamics of the entity itself in such a way that, as Marx said, "Each concept is also a postulate" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 46, Part I, p 229). Naturally, the source of movement (existence, functioning) and the development of this integrity are a contradiction, conceived as its essence. Marx's study of a historically specific socioeconomic system--the bourgeois system--in a state of unity and interconnection among all its aspects ("rather than the life of a specific country or nation or even class, etc." i.e., of any one of its aspects) converted the materialistic understanding of history "into its exclusive scientific understanding" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 1, p 140).

The brilliant results obtained by Marx in "Das Kapital" proved the accuracy of the materialistic theory not only in terms of the capitalist system or one of the "periods" in the involvement of mankind but as applicable to its entire history as well. The need for a dialectical-materialistic method, which was so efficiently used by Marx, Lenin goes on to say, "applies to the other social systems, although they were not subject to a special actual study or detailed analysis" (ibid., p 143). Vladimir Il'ich explains that it is not a question of making reality fit a predetermined system such as, for example, the notorious Hegelian triad (or, rather, the vulgarized Hegelian triad) but, conversely, creatively to apply the general truths developed by science to the study of the actual situation. The dialectical method is not a system



referred to as a substantiating argument but a scientific method, a means for the study and interpretation of history. Therefore, the understanding of a single specific integer, of a single socioeconomic system, provides the key to the study of the others without replacing the study itself.

Assertions may be found in contemporary philosophical literature to the effect that this methodological stipulation is accurate in terms of the past but in no case of the future and not even the present, if this present in itself has not been theoretically reproduced. A developed object provides a methodological foundation for understanding what is less developed, the supporters of this view claim. However, a developed object must already exist and be studied to make this possible. Therefore, here again knowledge should begin with the present, for the present is the result of previous history and is always more developed compared to it, for which reason the past must be studied subsequently and a prediction of the future made. Is this so?

Let us trace once again the conversion of historical materialism from a scientific hypothesis to a theory as proved by Lenin. It was Marx who initiated the development of a materialistic understanding of history as a theoretical concept in the course of his critical restructuring of Hegelian philosophy of the law and of the social theories of English and French 18th century writers. Since this entire theoretical legacy in itself, as Lenin pointed out, did not make possible a "strictly scientific attitude toward historical and social problems," the only consequence of their critical reworking could merely yield a hypothesis which, although it was the first to indicate said opportunity, was still only a hypothesis. Its significance to the scientific penetration into the essence of the social organism of the present, accomplished by Marx and Engels, in itself proved, precisely as we pointed out, that ever since "Das Kapital" appeared it stopped being a hypothesis. It is as of then that we were given a science of the history of mankind, which offers an initial theoretical foundation for penetrating into the essence of the present and the possibility of a scientific prediction of the future.

What does this prediction consist of?

Above all, it is a clarification of the general trend followed by universal history. The capitalist system analyzed by Marx was not the first social system in the development of mankind. Its theoretical depiction enables us also to understand the history of previous systems and their origins, establishment, development and replacement by another higher system. We see, therefore, that it is a question not of an understanding of a universal "law" which is obtained only by singling out features and phenomena equally inherent in all social organisms but understanding the general historical trend which develops from the knowledge of the law governing the replacement of one system with another. "Marx rejects precisely the idea," Lenin writes, "that the laws of economic life remain the same in terms of the past and the present. On the contrary, each historical period has its own laws" (ibid, p 167). Such an understanding of the development of mankind enables us to see with each transition to a new social system the legitimate growth of some characteristics, features and forms of social life and, conversely, the



withering away of others; in other words, it enables us to learn the objective logic of history.

Therefore, turning to history enables us to understand the unified trend of social development and to formulate the necessary theoretical postulates for the study of the present. Such postulates, in addition to a clarification of general historical trends, include the overall logic of the inner development of socioeconomic systems. At this point, however, we must remember that this logic is merely a prerequisite for the study of a specific entity. For example, historical materialism discovered the law according to which the dialectics of production forces and production relations is the foundation for the existence of any type of social system. However, such a general formulation of the law is merely a starting point in the study of any specific social system. The main task is to determine the type of dialectics (i.e., the unity and opposites of production forces and production relations and their reciprocal rejection and interpenetration) of this specific socioeconomic system and social entity. The study of a specific society is the second component of the scientific prediction of the future and a necessary factor in the formulation and promotion of strategic objectives in social activity. Therefore, it is only the general theoretical knowledge previously attained in the study of the present that can provide a clear and accurate idea of the future. Not a turn from the present to the past or belittling the present for the sake of the future and not losing sight in the bustle of events of the main strategic objectives but the organic unity of all such components is the inseparable, the basic feature of Marxist-Leninist social science. Any attempt at separating such components is fraught with the danger of paying a tremendous theoretical and practical price.

Social practice is nothing other than the purposeful activity of mankind. It is very important, therefore, for such activity to be truly expedient. In the opposite case the uncontrolled organization and development of social relations cannot be eliminated and neither could the negative consequences of such spontaneous developments. For the purpose is not only to describe the future but to organize deliberate control over social processes today. As the experience of ideological and political struggle confirms, opportunism has always started by underestimating the end objective.

To this day, however, we still come across in our publications a rather scornful attitude toward understanding the future and the significance of such understanding in terms of the past. Still noted is the desire of some authors to pit the future against the present and to deprive the people of their future prospects for the sake of so-called "basic primary values and joys of human existence." Naturally, the meaning of life should be sought above all in the present and in present affairs. However, it could be hardly realized fully without taking the future into consideration.

The writings of the liberal populists were crowded with such accusations addressed at the Marxists. Lenin not only convincingly refuted such "accusers" by proving the entire nonsense of their criticism, but clearly demonstrated the fact that the depth and consistency in resolving the immediate problems of the bourgeois-democratic reorganization of social life in Russia depend on the extent to which the revolutionaries and the working

class would struggle consciously and consistently for the implementation of the more distant objective--the socialist revolution. Lenin's very first printed work marked the birth of a bolshevik program which subsequently developed into two organically interlinked sections: A maximum program and a minimum program, thus becoming a leading party document at the Second RSDWP Congress. This program was fulfilled in October 1917.

How did the liberal populists counter the Marxist scientific understanding of social life in Russia and the clear analysis of the correlation and nature of class and political forces? With a utopian "ideal" based upon the principle of "taking the best from everything." "The subjective method in sociology," Lenin pointed out, "is very clear here: Sociology begins with utopia--the fact that the land belongs to the worker--and conditions for the implementation of this wish are indicated: 'taking' the good wherever it exists. Such philosophers consider social relations from a purely metaphysical point of view, as a simple mechanistic combination of both institutions, a simple mechanical coupling of phenomena" (op. cit., vol 1, p 191). Yet if this is a simple unit with replaceable parts, why not reorganize it in accordance with the ideal model of "socialism," a model structured in accordance with "human nature" or eternal abstract "verities" of goodness and beauty? "...In order to substantiate their views, the older socialists deem it sufficient to prove the oppression of the masses under the current regime and the superiority of a system under which everyone would obtain that which he has earned himself and to prove the consistency between this ideal system and 'human nature,' with a concept of a sensible-moral life, etc.," (ibid., pp 156-157).

However, abstract verities are universal and eternal only in terms of their form. Their content always rests on the earth and has a historically specific meaning.

Lenin identified the class foundation of this ideal and proved that it was nothing but an expression of the reliance and the expectations of the petty producer suffering from oppression as a vestige of medieval times (autocratic above all) and the strengthening of the middle and upper bourgeoisie. "Capitalism for the landless workers; land ownership and not capitalism; they limit themselves to this calming philosophy, ignoring the entire social organization of the economy, forgetting the universally known fact that land ownership does not eliminate in the least the beastly poverty of such farmers who are subject to the most shameless plunder on the part of other such landowners--the 'peasants'" (ibid., p 214). Failing to understand the nature of these or other social phenomena and the reasons for their appearance and development trends, and even failing to raise this question, the populists extracted desired features from different social systems in structuring their ideal. Their subjective method in sociology was a variety of the method of vulgar utopianism, which Marx convincingly criticized in his "Poverty of Philosophy." "According to him, Mr. Prudhon, all economic categories have two sides: good and bad. He considers categories the way the petit bourgeois considers great historical personalities: Napoleon was a great man; he did a great deal of good but he also brought a great deal of evil. Taken together, the good aspect and the bad aspect and the usefulness and harm are, in Mr. Prudhon's view, a contradiction which is inherent in each economic category. The problem to be resolved is the following: to preserve the good side and to

eliminate the bad" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 4, p 134). Instead of an understanding of the laws of social development we have a structuring of the desired from existing "positive" aspects; instead of determining the activities of social forces, based on their place and role in a historically developed social organism, we have a turn to a general, an amorphous mass, with interpretations of the usefulness of good and the harmfulness of evil; instead of a scientifically substantiated objective of the revolutionary reorganization of a society based on the exploitation of man by man, we have a reliance on the "socialist instinct" of the petit bourgeois. Could such "ideal of socialism" attract the broad toiling masses? The development of the populist movement answered this question convincingly.

As a revolutionary movement populism entered the arena of struggle at a time when the path of the proletarian, the socialist revolution, theoretically founded by Marx and Engels, and practically tested through the class battles of the European proletariat, was already open. However, seeing all the horrors and calamities of the system of bourgeois exploitation, the Russian revolutionaries assumed that Russia should have its own transition to a socialist society, radically different from the one in the western European countries. In considering the peasant community as the embryo of socialism, they saw in the peasants the mass force which could be energized through the heroism of a handful of revolutionaries. Carried away by this idea, they failed to notice (nor did they want to) that capitalism was already developing in Russia, the grounds for which had been established (although "halfway," so to say without any deep plowing) by the reform of 1861. The drops of the heroic blood of the populists, falling on the soil of Russian reality, could nurture only individual revolutionary shoots. The sacrifices of the populists, who tried to raise the peasant masses to the struggle against autocracy, failed to yield the desired results. The peasantry remained deaf. Faith in a peasant "socialist" revolution, based on faith in the original communal system of Russian life was increasingly unable to withstand the pressure of reality, the more so since this belief could not be supported theoretically. Necessarily, it had either to yield to a scientific understanding of Russia's development, which could be achieved only on the basis of Marxist positions and, consequently, also yield to the scientifically substantiated objectives of the revolutionary movement, or else develop into a reliance on the mercy...of autocracy. It was thus that tsarism--the organ of the exploiting classes in Russia, the instrument of oppression and the main enemy of the populist revolutionaries--was presented in the writings of their liberal descendants as a force aimed at "benefitting the people!" The liberal populists saw as the main task of the state autocratic apparatus the protection of the "economically weak from the economically strong." Lenin qualified this program of the "friends of the people," a philanthropic nonsense. "From a political program aimed at raising the peasantry to a socialist revolution against the foundations of contemporary society a program was born aimed at mending, 'improving' the situation of the peasantry while preserving the foundations of contemporary society" (op. cit., vol 1, p 272).

This was an open betrayal of the ideals of the revolutionary movement: yielding to and begging concessions and tips from the autocracy instead of fighting it. The liberal populists "clearly proved through their tactics that only one step separates political radicalism from political opportunism in the



absence of a materialistic criticism of political institutions and lack of understanding of the class nature of the contemporary state" (ibid., p 265).

Here again, Lenin quite deliberately made a moral judgment of the political assessments of the strategy and tactics of liberal populism. This was not only because of a betrayal of the ideals of revolutionary populism, which had waged an uneven battle with a very strong and fierce enemy--tsarism--a battle which, although pursuing utopian objectives carried within itself a tremendous moral charge and, consequently, was of major educational importance to subsequent generations of revolutionaries. The betrayal called for moral condemnation and it was condemned. It was thus that the moral justice of the revolutionary cause now became the justice of Lenin and the Leninists. This, however, was not the only reason. Lofty objectives demand lofty moral qualities of their supporters. Such objectives must be accepted on a profoundly personal basis. It is true that nothing great can be accomplished without passion. Through his entire character, activities and life the leader of the proletarian revolution confirmed this truth. His was a life spent in a continuing struggle of high emotional tension and a tremendous stress of all the forces of his soul. "Such is my destiny," Lenin wrote at the end of 1916. "One battle campaign after another against political stupidity, baseness, opportunism, etc. This has been going on since 1893 and that is the reason for the hatred of the vulgar people. Nevertheless, I would not change anything in my destiny for the sake of 'peace' with those vulgar people" (op. cit., vol 49, p 340).

Do only great objectives demand the efforts of the soul? People achieve what they wish not indifferently or without emotion. This is a basic truth the repetition of which may seem superfluous. Such may have been the case if to this day there were no publications (or even popular literary works) which speak a great deal and beautifully about model qualities of the individual such as serving the truth, goodness and beauty, firmness of faith, the indestructibility of hope and loyalty of love, but all of it only for the sake of pitting the individual "ideal" against lofty social objectives. It is as though "social programs" (the expression used by the author of one such publication) are addressed only to the minds of the people rather than their hearts and feelings. The entire passion invested in Lenin's work, which we are considering does not leave the reader indifferent even a century later, although here again it is a question of a "social program" which, furthermore, has already been implemented.

The practical theories of philistine progress, promoted by liberal populists, are not merely illusory or sterile, Lenin said in summing up his political analysis. They are frankly reactionary. They are reactionary because they gloss over the social antagonism in Russian reality. They are reactionary because they absolutely fail to realize the need for struggle (for a desperate struggle) which the working people themselves must wage for their liberation. That is precisely why the "socialists must break decisively and once and for all with all petit bourgeois ideas and theories. This is the main useful lesson which must be derived from this campaign" (op. cit., vol 1, p 296).

In tracing the ideological and political evolution of populism, Lenin exposed its class roots. Essentially, this evolution was determined by the changes



within the peasantry and its status in society as a petit bourgeois after the 1861 reform. It was precisely the expectations of the petty farmers and petty producers, suppressed by bourgeois relations and steadily reproducing such relations, which were reflected in the views of the "friends of the people." "They would like a market economy without capitalism--a capitalism without expropriation and without exploitation, which would include merely the petit bourgeois, peacefully vegetating under the protection of human land owners and liberal administrators" (ibid., p 246). The main feature of their class ideology is a denial of any class orientation in words, ignoring the fact that they themselves are steadily and hourly giving birth to capitalism. They call for classlessness, for "the petty producer, separated and isolated by the conditions themselves of the production process, tied to a specific place and specific exploiter, is unable to understand the class nature of the exploitation and oppression from which he suffers sometimes no less than the proletariat. He is unable to understand that in a bourgeois society the state itself must be a class-oriented state" (ibid., p 266).

Fully in accordance with the social position of the petit bourgeois, assuming a position of political opportunism and thus betraying the cause of the revolutionary movement, his learned "friends and benefactors" remained loyal to one of the biggest errors of populism--their lack of understanding of class antagonism within the peasantry (see ibid., p 262). They confused farmhands with kulaks and hired workers and those who hired them in a single common mass described as "the people." There have been many subsequent "friends" and "benefactors" who have tried, in the name of the people and allegedly for the sake of their interest, to assert classlessness and the obsolescence of the class approach adopted by the Marxist-Leninists in the study of the basic processes of social life! How many more times did this "obsolete" approach alone help to detect behind such good intentions the muscle of the petty farmer, petit bourgeois and philistine!

The stress of the struggle, the passionate arguments between Lenin and N. K. Mikhaylovskiy and other members of liberal populism and the sharpness of Lenin's assessments could hardly be explained merely with the fact that they took place in the heat of an argument. Twenty years were to pass before Lenin was to resume such polemics and to reemphasize that he was not arguing against one individual or another, who may be guided perhaps by good intentions but against the ideological trends supported by such an individual, expressing the aspirations of petit bourgeois social strata, sharing all their strong and weak sides. Strong, for bourgeois democracy fought for the destruction of the vestiges of feudalism and serfdom and was the ally of the proletariat in this struggle. Weak, for this struggle was inconsistent and tended to grant concessions to autocracy and even to rely on it somewhat. Its objectives were bourgeois also concealed behind socialist slogans.

It was on the basis of this principled position that Lenin characterized N. K. Mikhaylovskiy himself: "The great historical merit of Mikhaylovskiy in the bourgeois democratic movement in favor of the liberation of Russia was the fact that he warmly sympathized with the oppressed situation of the peasants and energetically fought against any and all manifestations of the oppression of serfdom. He defended in the legal and open press, although through hints, his sympathy and respect for the 'underground,' which the most consistent and

firm raznochintny demokrats operated and even personally and directly helped this underground.... However, as a warm supporter of the freedom of the oppressed peasant masses, Mikhaylovskiy shared all the weaknesses of the bourgeois-democratic movement" (op. cit., vol 24, pp 333-334). In the economic, philosophical and sociological areas, Lenin went on to say, "Mikhaylovskiy's views were bourgeois-democratic, concealed behind alleged 'socialist' phraseology" (ibid., pp 334-335). Mixing bourgeois-democratic with socialist views and confusing the positions held by the different classes--the peasantry and the proletariat--in the political struggle, Lenin pointed out, "is a reactionary adventure" (ibid., p 335). This was Lenin's summation of his polemics with the liberal populists.

Almost a century has passed since. It may seem that today we live in an entirely different age. However, to this day the question of the socialist and communist ideal, its attainability and ways to attain it remain in the very center of the ideological struggle. However, today as well the entire set of "critical arguments," once formulated by the liberal populists against this ideal as a scientifically founded prediction of the future and a historically necessary objective of the struggle and constructive work, is extensively used by our ideological opponents. This is entirely understandable, for as long as a class enemy exists to defend the "values" of bourgeois society, i.e., a society without a future, by virtue of its historical doom it cannot offer alternatives to Marxism, which would be adopted as the personal, long-range and conscious cause of the broad toiling masses. Consequently, this enemy cannot formulate any whatsoever essentially new objections to Marxist-Leninist theory. As a result of the changed circumstances and a different historical situation, naturally such objections have been modified and the means of their presentation may be quite varied. Essentially, they are the old familiar ones: the fact that, allegedly, the communist (socialist) ideal has not been confirmed and scientifically developed, the fact that life allegedly follows an entirely different path from the one predicted by the Marxists and that this ideal is alien to the humanistic aspirations of mankind. These are old acquaintances whose "durability" confirms merely the fact that the path to the future is hard and complex and that our epoch, the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism and communism, is an era of radical change in the entire history of mankind.

As an ideological trend Marxism-Leninism was born in the struggle not only against its direct class enemy--the open bourgeois ideology--but also against various types of petit bourgeois "socialisms" or their reflection within the workers movement. Lenin's work "Who Are Those 'Friends of the People' and Do They Struggle Against Social Democrats?" marked the completion of the ideological routing of populist "socialism," which had started with the "Liberation of Labor" Marxist group, founded abroad and headed by G. V. Plekhanov. It indicated a way for the Russian revolutionary movement out of a reactionary-utopian dead end. Since that time the path of the socialist revolution became illuminated by Lenin's thoughts.

In launching his campaign against Marxism, N. K. Mikhaylovskiy said: "History may have in store for us surprises 'which our wise men may not have even dreamed about'." The first surprise which he himself had to experience was

the fact that Marxism, a science he considered "strange," suddenly began to gain recognition in Russia. At that time this seemed to him something entirely improbable. History, however, put everything in its proper place. The objective, which was scientifically substantiated and which was adopted by the broad toiling strata as their own, could not fail to defeat a utopian ideal. This is confirmed not only by the defeat of the liberal populists but by the subsequent 90 years of struggle and construction.

The objective of the communists was based on a scientific understanding of the laws governing social development and a clear concept of the forces heading the progress of contemporary society. Their objective was the inevitable and most important aspect of world-transforming practice. That is precisely why communist social scientists consider theoretical activities not merely a cognitive reflection of reality but the formulation of the scientific foundations of socially significant strategic objectives the maturing of which is determined by the historical development of society and which cannot be achieved without the active efforts of all working people. The Marxist-Leninist classics have repeatedly emphasized that there can be no revolutionary practice without revolutionary theory.

The task of clarifying the path of history is complex and Marx, Engels and Lenin did a tremendous amount of work to resolve it. Naturally, not one of them tried to formulate in detail a plan for a new society, or plan "that which no one can know." They depicted the outlines of the future on the basis of a profound analysis of the entire historical process and the scientific study of the laws of scientific development. This scientific prediction was refined steadily, continually and purposefully and was made increasingly clear. Through their entire activities the Marxist-Leninist classics proved that theoretical work aimed at refining and identifying increasingly new features of the future must not be interrupted regardless of circumstances. The more tremendous the changes which occur in reality are, the more urgent becomes the need for their theoretical summation and interpretation and the more urgent becomes the need to refine and concretize the end objective itself.

Let us bear in mind that whereas in the final decades of the 19th century the program formulated by the "Liberation of Labor" group was quite adequate in determining the tasks of the Russian revolutionary movement, a program which Lenin described as a most general Marxist statement, at the time of the upsurge of the broad labor movement and the time of the creation of its progressive vanguard--the Bolshevik Party--a scientific program of action had already become necessary, with a more "specific view on the subject." After the maximum program had been implemented through the socialist revolution and in the most tense period of the civil war and the first years which followed it, the party and Lenin developed the theoretical problems of the strategy of building socialism. To this day, more than 60 years later, when the socialist society in the USSR had entered the stage of its maturity and when this stage has become profoundly scientifically reflected in the concept of developed socialism, the urgent need has appeared for further refining and concretizing our strategy through the current CPSU program. The entry of Soviet society into a historically lengthy stage of developed socialism demands of all social scientists to energize their scientific research and decisively address the



key practical problems facing the country. "The interpretation of these problems in their entirety and earmarking a clear long-term strategy for resolving them and indicating the link between our current affairs and the communist future," Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized at the February 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "is what the new draft of the party program must give us."

Communism is our lofty and noble objective. The ascension to it is sharp, difficult and twisting. This path consists of a number of daily concerns and the surmounting of daily difficulties, major and minor, and the struggle against our enemies which goes on uninterrupted even for a moment. It is very important not to forget even for a minute that the guiding star of the communist future must never be clouded behind the "fever of daily life."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2



## NATIONAL LABOR POTENTIAL: HOW TO USE IT MORE EFFECTIVELY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 27-38

[Article by Dr of Economic Sciences L. Kunel'skiy]

[Text] The labor potential includes all citizens able to participate in the public production process according to their physical capabilities, knowledge and professional skills. Along with the manpower directly involved in production it may include individuals who could work in principle but for a variety of reasons--social or personal--are not employed in the national economy.

Under capitalism the labor potential is chronically underutilized. As a result of mass unemployment even in the most developed capitalist countries the share of individuals deprived of the person's inalienable right--the right to work--is as high as 10-15 percent of the entire active population. At the same time, the exploitation of the working class and the other toiling strata and not only the physical but the mental and psychological capacities of the people are used with a view to earning profits and superprofits.

It is only under the conditions of real socialism that public ownership and planned economic management ensure objective conditions for granting one and all the possibility to work, to increase labor productivity and their contribution to public production and, on this basis, ensure the steady enhancement of the living standards of the people. At the same time, significant changes occur in the manpower itself by cultivating, as K. Marx pointed out, "all the characteristics of the social person and his development as a person with the richest possible characteristics and relations and, therefore, needs--the production of a person as the fullest and most universal product of society..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, part I, p 386).

### I

The special need for the efficient yet thrifty utilization of manpower was repeatedly noted at the 26th CPSU Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums. This is determined by a number of most important factors, above all the fact that during the 1980s a decisive turn must be made in the intensification of all sectors and production areas. Equally important is the

developing demographic situation characterized by a sharp decline in the increase of the able-bodied population. Finally, we must also take into consideration the fact that the manpower situation substantially fluctuates from one area to another in the country.

Total employment is the greatest social accomplishment of socialism. Whereas on the eve of the Great Patriotic War two-thirds of the active population was engaged in public production, at the start of the 1960s approximately eight-ninths and, today, more than nine-tenths are either working or studying on a full-time basis (the balance--less than one-tenth--are mainly women raising small children).

The right to work in the developed socialist society is constitutionally backed by the right to choose one's profession, type of occupation and job in accordance with one's vocation, abilities, professional training and education and social requirements. This enables all citizens of the USSR to apply their abilities and to establish prerequisites for the increasingly full and comprehensive self-expression. It is important to note that under these circumstances labor is increasingly becoming the main criterion of the person's status in society; collectivistic principles are strengthened and a healthy moral climate inaccessible under a capitalist system is established.

By now the Soviet Union has acquired a tremendous labor potential. In 1983 there were about 129 million workers, employees and kolkhoz members. In other words, roughly one of every two people in the country (on 1 January 1984 the USSR population totaled 274 million) was directly employed in public production. The increased number of working people substantially outstripped the population increase as a whole. Compared to the prewar 1940, whereas in 1984 the population of the USSR had increased by 40 percent, the number of people holding jobs had more than doubled. These changes occurred despite the effect of a number of major factors: most of the more than 20 million casualties of the Great Patriotic War were members of the active population group; the length of mandatory education today has been extended to full secondary training as compared to the seventh-grade education which was mandatory before the war; the overall number of pensioners has increased from 4 million in 1940 to 53.6 million at the beginning of 1984. Therefore, the substantially faster increase in the number of employed people compared with the increase in the overall population is explained by the additional involvement in public production of individuals previously working their private plots or doing housework, most of them women.

As to the overall increase in the number of working people, it is entirely determined by the increased number of workers and employees, i.e., of people directly related to the most consistently socialist--public--form of ownership. Meanwhile, the number of kolkhoz members has declined, rather than increased, from 29 to 13 million people, or by a factor of 2.3, which has resulted in major changes in the socioclass structure. More than 87 percent of the country's population today consists of workers and employees and their families. The thorough scientifically substantiated assessment of the development of Soviet society in recent decades allowed the 26th Party Congress to formulate the theoretically important concept of major practical significance to the effect that the establishment of its classless structure

will take place in its main and essential features within the historical framework of mature socialism.

During the 9th and 10th five-year plans and particularly in recent years a substantial relative and even absolute slowdown in the increase in the number of workers and employees was noted. Thus, whereas it was 2.3 million people in 1979, it declined to 900,000 in 1983. Increases in the number of new workers will decline further in 1984 and in subsequent years.

A possible increase in the growth of the able-bodied population may be expected only in the second half of the 1990s, on the basis of a certain increase in the birth rate during the 1970s (from 17.4 per thousand in 1970 to 18.5 in 1981) and the implementation of a broad set of measures aimed at improving the health of the population, including that of the elderly.

Therefore, the objectively developing situation most clearly proves the urgent need to take a variety of steps aimed at the more efficient and effective utilization of the available manpower potential, for the further development of production and, correspondingly, the solution of social problems, depend extensively, if not exclusively, on upgrading the labor output of those already employed in the national economy. During the 11th Five-Year Plan approximately nine-tenths of the increase in the national income and industrial output will be based on higher labor productivity and only 10 percent on the increased number of working people. As a rule, the entire increase of output in operating enterprises must take place with the same or fewer personnel.

Is this realistic? The practical experience of many enterprises in all economic sectors, industry above all, confirms the full possibility of this kind of intensive development. A number of enterprises and organizations are systematically increasing their volume of output and improving their quality without increasing and, in a number of cases, even reducing the size of their personnel. According to 1982 data, in sectors such as the power industry, chemical and petroleum machine building, instrument making and the timber, cellulose-paper and timber processing industries, the overfulfillment of plans and virtually the entire increase in output by 5-10 percent (in terms of normative-net output) were the result of higher labor productivity.

However, as Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU general secretary, pointed out, "we can and wish to advance faster. We can and must resolve more energetically problems of intensive economic development, for it is only on this basis that the increased satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the people becomes possible."

A number of major changes which have taken place in the sex and age structure and, above all, the qualitative composition of the working people are contributing to the more efficient utilization of the manpower potential. Said changes largely counteract the quantitative slowdown of their increased numbers. Thus, while according to the 1959 population census there were 20.7 million more women than men, in subsequent years the gap gradually narrowed. Today the ratio between them for people under 50 has become essentially equalized and by the mid-1980s there will be more men than women.



The most important factors which "dampen" the influence of the reduced increase in the size of the manpower are improvements in the qualitative structure of the working people and the substantial changes which have taken place in their professional-skill structure. Even at the beginning of the 1980s 846 out of 1,000 people employed in the national economy were graduates of higher or secondary (complete and incomplete) schools whereas by the end of the 1950s the share of such individuals was lower by one-half and equaled 433 people per 1,000 employed population. Most young working people under 30 are, as a minimum, graduates of general secondary schools. In the years to come this process will be directly influenced by the fact that a considerable percentage of the working people who reach retirement age are citizens who acquired their education, skills and practical experience under relatively adverse circumstances. A high percentage of them are unskilled, largely engaged in a variety of meaningless jobs. On the other hand, the replacement of those who drop out and a possible minor increase in the number of working people will be based virtually entirely on citizens with a high level of educational and vocational training and a developed need for creative active toil.

The professional structure of the working people is changing. The number of highly skilled workers handling modern complex and particularly complex equipment is growing the fastest. Thus, the number of tuners, above all those handling programmed machine tools, instruments and systems, operators servicing machine tools and machines controlled with computers and so on, is particularly increasing. Finally, we cannot ignore the fact that today nearly one-quarter of all workers in the national economy--about 32 million people--are specialists, graduates of higher or specialized schools.

As a whole, the increased educational and professional-skill levels and the advanced ideological upbringing of workers at the start of their labor careers are favorably influencing the production process and creating prerequisites for achieving high results.

The increased efficiency in the use of the labor potential presumes the solution of at least three closely interrelated problems: a) improving the distribution and redistribution of the manpower by sector and region of the country; b) making systematic changes in the work, aimed at increasing its creative nature and applying new progressive labor means and methods; c) further strengthening of labor discipline, organization and order in production and ensuring the productive utilization of the entire working time. All of this together should enable us to resolve the key economic problem of ensuring the dynamic development of the production process, converting it to an intensive track and achieving high end results with the lowest possible labor and material outlays.

## II

It is impossible to increase labor efficiency on the scale of the entire public production process without the availability of the necessary workers with corresponding professions, skills and qualification standards, precisely in types of production and realms of activity which constitute in their totality a single national economic complex. The requirements of the social



division of labor and deployment of labor resources must be taken into consideration. Therefore, economic development requires optimal deployment and redeployment of the overall manpower by economic sector and on the regional scale.

Let us point out above all a most important ratio such as assigning personnel to the various production and nonproduction sectors. For a long time both the absolute number and percentage of workers engaged in the nonproduction area out of the overall number of people employed in the national economy increased steadily. Thus, whereas in the prewar 1940 11.7 percent of people employed in the national economy were in nonproduction sectors, their share had reached 20.2 percent by 1965 and, finally, 26.6 percent by 1983. This was based above all on the need to resolve a number of major socioeconomic problems of the development of socialist society. At the same time, we must take into consideration that the increased volume of services and other types of work performed by people employed in nonproduction sectors was largely based on extensive factors and, above all, the additional recruitment of new manpower. Unless this situation is substantially changed in the very near future, a certain contradiction may develop between the need for a further accelerated increase in the volume and improvement in the quality of services and work performed in the nonproduction area and the extremely limited possibility of recruiting new workers in this sphere of activities.

The only solution to this situation is to increase labor efficiency not only in production sectors, which will create prerequisites for a certain redistribution of workers in favor of the nonproduction sphere, but also essentially to take corresponding steps directly in the nonproduction sectors.

Substantial reserves exist for more efficient work by personnel employed in the nonproduction sectors. This applies to services and sociocultural sectors, science and management. In this case, the increased use of labor mechanization tools, from the very simple to modern computers and automated systems, is of prime significance. For example, there is an urgent need for the use of computers by millions of accounting and office workers, i.e., people with relatively low skills. However, we must also install the appropriate facilities, instruments and mechanisms to enable us to relieve skilled workers such as designers, technologists and engineers and workers performing scientific research functions from underproductive labor, which is obviously inconsistent with the complexity of the work which such people could be doing.

Along with the application of various facilities which ease the work of the personnel in the nonproduction area and upgrade their efficiency, the active dissemination of progressive forms of labor organization and the broadening of the area and upgrading the quality of labor norming play an important role. Numerous examples indicate that workers in said sectors rarely work intensively in the course of the work day. Many organizations and establishments have surplus personnel. This adversely affects work indicators and the state of labor discipline.

As a whole, unquestionably, objective prerequisites exist for resolving the problem of the further development of the nonproduction sphere, above all on

the basis of improving the qualitative structure of its personnel and upgrading their output.

Most important changes are taking place in the distribution of the population between town and country. Whereas before the war approximately one-third of the population lived in cities, with rural residents accounting for the remaining two-thirds, today the situation is the diametric opposite: almost two-thirds of the population live in towns and only slightly more than one-third in rural areas. By specific type of employment, the nonagricultural population in the country accounted for 77 percent, compared to 23 percent of the agricultural population.

This situation triggers a number of most important national economic problems. An increasingly high percentage of the population is turning from food producers to consumers. This means that the production of agricultural commodities is possible only on the basis of increased intensification. In turn, upgrading agricultural efficiency calls for retaining a number of worker categories in the countryside, above all those trained to use complex and highly productive equipment. Finally, in this connection it is important not only to increase wages and to improve payments and benefits from social consumption funds, but also to develop the rural social infrastructure comprehensively.

The main tasks in this area have been defined in the Food Program. Let us point out that as early as 1983 the wages of many categories of rural workers were improved and the connection between their wages and specific work accomplishments was strengthened, above all in terms of upgrading crop yields and livestock productivity. This was followed by steps to retain cadres in animal husbandry. Considerable funds have been invested in improving housing and living conditions, the construction of children's preschool establishments in the countryside and road building.

Bearing in mind the seasonal nature of agricultural work, it is important to ensure the more efficient work of urban residents recruited for such work and, at the same time, to provide better labor opportunities for kolkhoz members and sovkhos workers between seasons. Let us note in this connection that a number of progressive kolkhozes and sovkhos are successfully coping with all farmwork without using the labor of the urban population. Therefore, additional manpower should be recruited exclusively with consideration for kolkhoz members and sovkhos workers operating at full capacity. As to agricultural work between seasons, attention should be paid to the creation of shops and branches of enterprises, particularly in agroindustrial complexes, mainly related to the processing of agricultural commodities and utilization of local raw materials. This will contribute to strengthening the ties between town and country, retaining cadres, young people above all, in the countryside, increasing the production of consumer goods and upgrading the living standards of rural workers.

From the viewpoint of the efficient utilization of the labor potential, particular attention should be paid to the major disparities in population and manpower reproduction in the various parts of the country. In most areas, where the increase in the active population is either quite limited or even

lacking, clearly the main attention should be concentrated on the reconstruction and technical retooling of operating enterprises. As the experience of many enterprises in all economic sectors indicates, this yields substantial economic results with relatively low outlays compared to results, particularly taking into consideration the existence of developed collectives of skilled manpower. We must also point out that despite the steps which were taken the share of outlays for the reconstruction and technical retooling of operating enterprises has been growing sluggishly in the overall volume of capital investments and that the implementation of such steps is by no means always comprehensive, particularly from the viewpoint of centralizing the various types of auxiliary production facilities.

At the same time, corresponding measures in regions with manpower surplus, in rural areas in particular, should be taken in two areas. Above all, the various types of output should be expanded (including those utilizing local raw materials), as a rule involving labor-intensive operations. At the same time, upgrading the population mobility is of great importance, enabling us to use existing manpower in areas where its utilization would be most expedient from production considerations. Improving the organizational forms of manpower distribution and redistribution, more extensive utilization of the practice of Komsomol call-ups and disseminating the experience of a number of union republics in youth production training in vocational-technical schools located in manpower-scarce parts of the country, play a considerable role in resolving this problem.

Attracting and retaining cadres in parts of Siberia and the Far East to which the fuel-energy and raw material base of the country is increasingly shifting, is particularly important. Until recently, the manpower turnover of arriving and departing people here was roughly balanced. Consequently, the state spent substantial funds for moving a number of working people categories while the size of the population, including that of active age, remained virtually the same in said areas. By the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s certain positive changes were noted in this area, determined by a variety of socioeconomic measures contributing to the greater stability of cadres and their increased labor productivity.

The accelerated building of housing, networks of children's preschool establishments, schools and hospitals is of major importance in attracting and retaining cadres. Furthermore, in Siberia and the Far East certain benefits are granted in terms of higher wages and social consumption benefits. Thus, higher partial payments are made to working women caring for a child under the age of 1 and aid for children is given to families with an average per capita income of 75 rubles per month.

It would be difficult to overestimate the significance of the radical changes in public labor in upgrading the efficiency of people employed in the national economy. Under socialism, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the creation of better conditions for the comprehensive development of the individual are the base of such reorganizations under socialism.



The most topical problem today is that of the fastest possible elimination of still-widespread manual operations, heavy physical labor and nonprestigious and meaningless types of work in national economic sectors. Taking into consideration the cultural-educational and vocational-technical standards of the working people, above all those who enter public production, this situation, if continued, could lead in the very immediate future to an acute shortage of workers needed in a number of production sectors and create difficulties in ensuring the systematic conversion of the economy to intensive management methods. So far tens of millions of people continue to do manual work in industry, agriculture, construction, transportation, trade, and many other sectors.

It will be necessary to eliminate in its essential aspects the use of manual labor at jobs given priority in mechanization as early as the 1980s. This task is set in the Food Program for crop growing and animal husbandry. Obviously, this could be achieved in other economic sectors as well.

Reequipping production facilities with proper tools and labor resources--very complex as well as relatively simple--unquestionably plays a determining role from this viewpoint. The 1984 plan itself calls for the manufacturing of more than 11,000 automated manipulators with programmed controls, which exceeds the assignment of the five-year plan by one-half. Furthermore, at a number of enterprises up to 65 percent of manual operations could be mechanized by the labor collectives themselves, particularly by using the advantages of sectorial and regional labor cooperation for such purposes. The majority of the people engaged in manual labor are concentrated in auxiliary production facilities, transportation, loading and unloading and warehousing operations above all. Releasing a single person from manual labor in auxiliary production requires, as a rule, one-half to one-fourth fewer funds compared to workers in basic production.

At the same time we must take into consideration certain negative consequences which may arise under the conditions of comprehensively mechanized and automated production. This means the appearance of some monotonous jobs which impoverish labor functions. The practice of many leading enterprises shows the way to resolving this important socioeconomic problem. Above all, the experience of the Volga Automotive Plant in creating systems of professional promotion of workers and planned shifting of people engaged in unattractive work to more skilled and, correspondingly, more meaningful types of work in accordance with their wishes, could be applied. The systematic certification of jobs helps to accelerate labor mechanization and the retooling of production on a new technical basis. This enables us to rate each job from the viewpoint of its consistency with contemporary requirements of productivity, organization and labor conditions and professional-skill structure of employed personnel. Based on the results of the certification, some jobs are being reorganized and modernized and some abolished. Therefore, as the experience of agricultural machine-building enterprises in Dnepropetrovsk, Kuybyshev and many other oblasts indicates, existing resources are concentrated on the most highly productive equipment. The shift coefficient of its work is increased, a better balancing between jobs and manpower resources is ensured and, as a whole, labor productivity is enhanced.



The reorganization of the labor process itself--giving it a creative nature and upgrading its efficiency--is directly related to the extensive application of progressive ways and means of work. This is a question, above all, of developing and upgrading the efficiency of collective (brigade) forms of labor organization and incentive. Such conditions offer the possibility of expanding the functions of the workers, performing complex operations and accelerating the growth of worker skills. In the final account, this leads to higher quality and more meaningful jobs.

The implementation of the various types of work with fewer personnel--the combination of skills, expansion of service areas and multiple machine-tool servicing--is of great importance in the economical and efficient utilization of the manpower. Enterprises and associations are granted the broadest possible rights in this area, including the use of wage savings for additional payments and supplements to those who work more intensively and productively, and releasing some personnel.

However, progressive means and methods are still insufficiently widespread. In terms of brigades, the main attention is focused to the quantitative rather than qualitative side of the problem, related to the application of the most efficient methods such as brigade contracting (cost accounting), brigade consolidation and work based on a single order with payments based on end results. In the same way the possibility of doing the work with a smaller staff is by no means always applied. At many machine-building enterprises, the number of workers trained in related skills is several times higher than the number of those who actually combine different types of work.

Strengthening the system of material and moral incentives will unquestionably contribute to upgrading labor efficiency. Particularly important in this respect is the decisive struggle waged against all types of equalization in wages and wages unrelated to the actual contributions of workers and collectives in achieving end results. We must ensure a combination of centralized steps to improve the organization of labor wages and norming (improved rate system, regional wage controls, etc.) with a comprehensive development of the initiative of enterprises in applying the most efficient forms of wages and bonus systems. The development of the social infrastructure, including benefits paid out of enterprise funds, will be a very efficient stimulating factor under contemporary conditions and even more so in the future.

The comprehensive use of the extensive rights in managing enterprises, organizations and establishments, granted labor collectives in accordance with the recently passed law, is of the greatest possible significance in the economical and rational utilization of the labor potential. Their participation in resolving all basic economic and social problems has been increased significantly.

Furthermore, the initial results of work under the conditions of the large-scale economic experiment in a number of industrial sectors (machine building and light, food and local industries) indicate its effectiveness. A set of measures is being implemented in the area of improving planning and material and technical procurements, intensifying material and moral incentives and

some other steps aimed generally at expanding the rights and upgrading the responsibility of enterprises for the results of production activities. This enables us to achieve better end results in the work, above all in terms of ensuring the full implementation of the plan for procurement and contractual obligations, i.e., the prompt and full production of precisely the type of commodities needed by consumers, while releasing some personnel, accelerating the growth rates of labor productivity and upgrading the quality of produced items. The further expansion of the experiments and the application of its principles in other sectors after thorough preliminary preparations could obviously yield significant national economic results.

Strengthening the labor discipline and improving the utilization of the working time are most important trends in upgrading labor efficiency. The situation in this area is still not entirely consistent with contemporary requirements. Above all, the existing and increasingly intensified labor division and cooperation requires the organized work of individual workers and labor collectives. A breakdown in any area leads to extremely adverse consequences along the entire production chain. Furthermore, taking into consideration the fact that production facilities are being equipped with new highly productive equipment, its idling leads to increasingly higher losses.

The developing situation clearly does not justify the practice of some enterprises and associations to "lure" the manpower. Instead of engaging in unquestionably more difficult and more efficient work to improve working and living conditions of their personnel, many managers try to ensure the availability of necessary cadres by artificially increasing their wages and granting unjustified benefits and advantages.

A certain "threshold" of the turnover exists. In other words, the socially permissible manpower turnover is related to the need for cadre rejuvenation and increased opportunities for applying one's work in accordance with one's profession, skills and capabilities. However, in many sectors and enterprises the turnover exceeds the permissible "threshold."

Unquestionably, strengthening labor discipline as a most important socioeconomic problem requires the solution of a number of problems and acting in various directions. It is a question of improving production organization, making the work more rhythmical, improving the working and living conditions of the workers and taking steps to encourage those who have worked long and conscientiously, as well as increasing the economic and administrative influence exerted on violators of labor discipline and engaging in a variety of educational projects. Wherever such activities are carried out on a comprehensive and planned basis corresponding results are ensured. Labor discipline indicators substantially better than their sectoral average have been achieved by the Dinamo plant in Moscow, the Leningrad Metallurgical Plant, the metallurgical combine in Magnitogorsk, a number of enterprises in Dnepropetrovsk and many others. Let us point out that such enterprises have been given no advantages whatsoever compared with similar enterprises in the same sector. Their successes in strengthening the labor discipline are based on the purposeful work of party, economic, trade union and Komsomol organizations and the comprehensive utilization of their opportunities.

Strengthening the labor discipline is largely a youth problem: as many as three-fifths of those who account for cadre turnover are workers under 30. Naturally, to a certain extent the social mobility of young workers and the search for jobs they like are justified. However, what is clearly unjustified is when as many as two-thirds of graduates of vocational-technical schools leave their enterprise because of dissatisfaction with production, housing, living and other conditions. Insufficient attention is frequently paid to problems of mastering professional skills by young workers. Frequently the need for youth tutors is only half met, and they are often selected at random.

Comprehensive efforts to strengthen labor discipline and directly relate it to the implementation of production assignments is necessary. This predetermines to a decisive extent the efficiency with which the labor potential is used and, correspondingly, the solution of the main socioeconomic problems. A number of collectives in various sectors in Moscow, Leningrad, Minsk, Chelyabinsk and others are examples of such work.

At the same time, the strengthening of labor discipline also depends on systematic work on the regional scale. We must adapt better the work schedule of service enterprises, organizations and establishments to the working hours of the bulk of workers and employees. It would be expedient to make more extensive use of effective means of retaining cadres such as granting loans and free aid for cooperative and individual housing construction and many others, particularly aid in purchasing durable goods.

So far, in a number of cities approximately one-third of the population has found jobs through organized channels, while the rest are directly recruited by associations and enterprises. However, it is precisely organized job placement channels which offer the most favorable conditions for finding work faster in accordance with the skills and wishes of the workers. This also contributes to retaining the cadres in their new jobs. Upgrading the role and improving the work of job placement bureaus will unquestionably contribute to the solution of this problem.

The job placement problem should be considered from a broader viewpoint of increasing the opportunity of young people, pensioners, women with children and those who would like to work during their free time. As to young people of proper age, despite certain positive changes such as, for example, the extensive development of the movement of student construction detachments, substantial unused reserves remain in the area of involving them in socially useful work. Studies have revealed that in a number of VUZs throughout the country one-half of the students and, frequently, even more want to work in their leisure time providing that proper conditions to this effect are created. We must take into consideration the fact that along with their economic effect, broadening the possibilities of the labor participation of young people is also of social importance from the viewpoint of strengthening labor morality and eliminating feelings of dependency among some young people.

In this respect, greater consistency must be developed between full-time, correspondence and night school, paralleled by improving the quality of training, particularly in correspondence schools; involving VUZ students, technical school students and students in the senior grades in useful labor



activities in the course of their training process and their leisure time; a better substantiated determination of the period of theoretical and practical training by offering practical experience, for example, including pregraduation work and preparing for a diploma directly on the job.

The systematic implementation of the steps stipulated in the school reform plays a most important role in improving the labor upbringing of young people and involving them faster in productive toil in the various areas and realms of activity. Briefly characterized, its most important objectives are, while comprehensively improving universal secondary training, adding to it universal professional training. In this manner the young people would be able to enter public production not only properly armed with contemporary knowledge in various fields of science and technology but also already possessing the necessary professional habits and a certain amount of skill.

A certain increase in the number of employed pensioners is possible in the years to come, mainly as a result of the increased number of people of retirement age. A considerable percentage of pensioners have the right to earn wages and receive a full or partial pension. Some categories of working people are offered the choice of receiving a pension or a wage for their work or a higher pension following retirement. Equally important is the creation of more favorable conditions for pensioners' labor and the implementation of further measures aimed at encouraging such labor.

Let us also note the existence of some further possibilities of recruiting women with children, essentially as a result of a more extensive use of flexible work schedules, half-day and half-week employment or work at home. Sociological studies indicate that, as a rule, women work on a part-time basis only in the very first years of the child's life and the start of his school period, after which they resume their usual work schedule.

In principle, the use of such means of attracting women into public production may be practiced in a great variety of economic sectors. However, the most efficient use of such forms of employment, as the practical experience of many oblasts in the Russian Federation and Belorussia and in the Baltic republics indicates, is in light and food industry, trade, public catering and population services. This creates favorable conditions for retaining women in production and reducing labor turnover. Work at home offers the possibility of increasing output without substantial outlays for the construction and maintenance of production premises. In all cases, a thoroughly planned and properly weighed approach to such problems is necessary, leading to more favorable conditions for women to combine motherhood and production work.

Increasing use of the advantages of socialism creates the necessary prerequisites for improving the use of the labor potential and enabling all working people to apply their capabilities, knowledge and professional skills and to upgrade labor efficiency. This requires efficient and organized work in all public production areas and within each enterprise and association.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## DEVELOPING THE DOMESTIC EXPORT POTENTIAL

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Oct 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 39-48

[Article by N. Smelyakov, USSR deputy minister of foreign trade]

[Text] The Soviet Union actively participates in the international division of labor. Foreign trade is one form of its manifestation. In terms of comparable prices, the volume of Soviet foreign trade increased by a factor of 13.3 from 1951 to 1981, compared with the gross national product, which increased by a factor of 8.9 within the same period. The average annual increase in foreign trade in prices for the corresponding years was 15.6 percent for the decade (1971-1980). Foreign trade reached 127.5 billion rubles in 1983 with a considerable surplus of exports over imports. This is consistent with the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress which call for "ensuring the further development of foreign trade and economic and scientific and technical cooperation with foreign countries. Making efficient use of the advantages of the international division of labor and the opportunity offered by foreign economic relations in upgrading public production efficiency."

In accordance with the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the domestic production of "science-intensive" machine-building output has been developed further: equipment for nuclear electric power plants, aerospace and laser technology, computers, programmed machine tools, processing centers, high-powered turbines, electronic items and semiconductors. The mass production of industrial robots has been undertaken and the production of automated and semi-automated lines is increasing. At the same time, the production of a broad range of consumer goods has increased, such as televisions, radios, watches, household refrigerators, motorcycles, bicycles, cameras, and household washing machines (including automated models). A considerable contribution has been made to the development of the infrastructure.

Foreign trade has become an important Soviet economic sector. Exports of machines and equipment have increased noticeably. Thus, they totaled 17.6 billion rubles in 1971-1975, 33.9 billion in 1976-1980 and 24.4 billion in 1981-1983.

The Soviet Union is one of the leading countries in international trade. Its foreign trade partners include more than 140 countries. The principal among



them are the socialist states with which it is engaged in extensive trade and cooperation.

The development of exports made it possible to import significant amounts of commodities needed by the Soviet Union. Various types of industrial equipment worth more than 90 billion rubles were purchased abroad during the 9th and 10th five-year plans. Equipment accounted for more than one-third of the country's overall imports. The share of imported foodstuffs and raw materials for their production increased.

Foreign trade, which is closely related to the national economy, is directly involved in the implementation of the party's economic program and in upgrading the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people.

The growth of foreign trade was achieved essentially through the development of the country's economy as a whole, the extracting and processing industries above all. "The development of production is the foundation of the national economy and international economic relations," noted L. B. Krasin, the first people's commissar for foreign trade. "Trade is merely the manifestation of the stage of production development reached." In other words, we must have the necessary level of industrial development and production capacities in the various sectors. However, we must take into consideration the fact that significant industrial capacities may be available without, however, having an adequate export potential, particularly in the area of machine industry items which meet the requirements of the world market. The same could be said of domestic market requirements.

The Soviet Union engages in foreign trade on a planned basis, in accordance with the law on state monopoly. The task is for the volume of exports always to exceed that of imports so that our balance of trade may be positive.

Hence our concern for accelerating exports and creating and maintaining domestic export potential on the necessary level.

What does export potential mean? It means the ability of industry and the national economy as a whole to produce the necessary amount of competitive goods for the foreign market; it means the totality of developed natural resources in the country and its economic and production possibilities, the existence of a corresponding infrastructure, well-trained scientific and industrial cadres and a marketing system capable of adapting not only individual items but the entire production structure to market requirements.

The Soviet Union has developed a substantial export potential and considerable capacities in the extracting and processing industries, agriculture and forestry and transportation. Science and technology have developed substantially. All of this has enabled us to export significant amounts of petroleum and petroleum products, natural gas, coal, coke, timber and timber materials and many others. Exports of machines, equipment and durable goods have increased as well.

A tremendous amount of exports is reaching a number of countries throughout the world. Our transport organizations are coping with this task.

As we pointed out, as a whole Soviet foreign trade is taking place on a balanced basis. In terms of machines and equipment, the balance is negative, i.e., more machines and equipment are imported than exported.

In some areas our export potential is still limited, although it has obvious advantages related to the ability to concentrate the necessary industrial capacities, which are under single-state management, on resolving important foreign trade problems. Let us consider the market for machines and equipment, which is under the strong influence of the scientific and technical revolution. Trade in machine-building items will retain its dynamism and the share of machines and equipment in world trade will be increasing. Demand for such items is increasing steadily. A great many new features are being introduced in machine design and manufacturing technology, materials and engineering methods. Therefore, industrial production must be flexible and adaptable.

The scientific and technical revolution has a tremendous impact on a country's situation in the world market. It sets ever new and stricter requirements for the commodities offered. In the area of machine building they cover the entire system of interrelated elements of "science-technology-production-marketing-servicing." In our country this cycle frequently breaks down at the production stage due to the exclusion of two important phases--marketing and servicing.

This truncated formula does not lead to attaining the final objective: the machine-building output must reach the consumer through the marketing authorities and be supported by high-quality service. Unfortunately, problems of technical servicing and organization of marketing and planning exports in accordance with the requirements of the domestic and foreign markets are not seriously studied in our country, which harms more than foreign trade alone.

This circumstance also leads to the fact that a number of trends of scientific and technical progress are not always considered in the formulation of comprehensive programs. It was no accident that the 26th CPSU Congress called for "developing the production of export commodities. Improving the structure of exports, above all by increasing the production and procurement of machine building and other finished goods consistent with the requirements of the foreign market, steadily upgrading their technical standards and quality and increasing procurements for the export of more highly processed commodities."

The extensive forms of development of capacities, based on quantitative growth alone are unacceptable in its implementation. A different approach is needed.

Under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution the moral obsolescence of machines and equipment and household appliances has increased substantially. This forces industry systematically and quickly to organize the replacement of obsolete models with new ones, consistent with higher criteria.

The scientific and technical revolution has significantly intensified capitalist competition, making it uncompromising and comprehensive. Like a

chain reaction the competitive struggle covers both the market and production, servicing and scientific research. It directs their activities in accordance with market requirements.

It is precisely under such circumstances that foreign trade takes place and industry produces commodities for export. The fast replacement of machine models on a higher technical and economic level is inevitable. Any slowdown in the use of scientific and technical achievements affects our exports (by reducing them).

On the international market our goods compete with the goods of the large capitalist corporations, which are well prepared for operating under the conditions of this market and mastered it long ago. It is here that the competitive quantities of a commodity are tested. Here no customer is interested in the reasons why a commodity is poor, its production outlays high or any other objective circumstance affecting the seller-exporter. If the commodity is substandard or expensive it will simply remain unsold.

The competitiveness of a specific commodity is not a constant. It changes with the intensification of scientific and technical progress, the steady changes in market requirements, and the introduction of new legislation and various rules and standards by the importing countries. Therefore, constant concern must be shown for maintaining the competitiveness of the output, which is the main indicator of the level of development of the export potential.

We know that competitiveness is based on consumer value. Marx wrote that "since a commodity is purchased not because of its value but because it is a 'consumer value' and used for a specific purpose, it is self-evident that 1) the consumer value is 'assessed,' i.e., studied on the basis of their quality (in precisely the same way that their quantity is measured, weighed, etc.); 2) when the various types of commodities may be substituted for each other for the same consumption purpose, preference is given to one variety or another, and so on and so forth" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 19, p 387).

Consequently, to begin with, competitiveness may be defined only as a result of the objective comparison among goods, i.e., it is a relative indicator; secondly, essentially it is a characterization of the commodity, reflecting its differences from the commodity of the competitor in terms of satisfying a specific social requirement. We must emphasize here that such a comparison must be objective. We cannot compare a new machine we have produced to an older one. It must be mandatorily compared to the new, the latest commodity produced by the competitor. Bearing in mind that in order to organize the serial production of a machine a certain amount of time is needed, while the competitor has already taken his model to the market, a certain anticipation in terms of technical standards must be invested in designing our machine.

Some economic managers frequently take for purposes of comparison the weakest or the obviously obsolete machine models which the competitor has been producing for the past few years. Such is the case, unfortunately, in frequent cases in certifying commodities as superior category. Yet the document on the certification procedure for industrial commodities, based on



two quality categories, stipulates that it can be certified if it can be competitive on the foreign market. Let us remember Yu. V. Andropov's stipulation that "quality standards must be assessed without any tolerances and must be the highest possible."

Unfortunately, there still are specialists in different organizations and industrial workers who believe that the competitiveness of a commodity is a capitalist category which, allegedly, does not pertain to our socialist industry. This is a gross error which, under certain circumstances could harm the national economy. When the competitiveness of domestic output, as the most important factor in assessing its standard, is ignored, the result is a subjective and, therefore, erroneous evaluation of the technical and economic standard of goods, machine-building output above all. This approach suits only those who are prepared to continue to produce obsolete noncompetitive goods without any trouble, for which it is frequently easier to obtain a bonus than for new commodities with a higher technical and economic standard, in demand on the foreign market. The certification of goods as superior category without any comparative analysis of that competitiveness and a departmental approach to assessing one's own accomplishments lead to an erroneous assessment of the situation in industry and, consequently, undesirable foreign trade results.

The need to consider competitiveness is obvious also when we sell domestically made machines and equipment to members of the socialist community. The point is that on their markets our machines and equipment face similar commodities coming from the capitalist countries, in which case the degree of competitiveness of our machine building becomes apparent.

Exports are tests graded by the world market, which is a strict examiner. "The consistency between best global and domestic models is an absolute minimum. We must accustom ourselves to this fact. We must strive to achieve it by decisively rejecting anything obsolete, backward or depreciated by life itself," the 26th CPSU Congress stipulated.

Our domestic industry has all the necessary possibilities of achieving competitiveness as an important link within the entire chain of the export potential. What is necessary is to change our attitude toward the problem itself of developing the export potential, which must be based essentially on perfecting our domestic industry, naturally based on the utilization of global experience.

As the communist party teaches us, we must convert more rapidly to intensive industrial work methods and restrain extensive trends in upgrading capacities, such as the numerical size of the machine fleet and production areas and increasing the size of the manpower. In the creation and production of new equipment its efficiency must significantly outstrip price increases.

It is difficult to accept the opinion of some industrial managers who, whenever the need to master the production of a new item becomes necessary, refer to a shortage of capacities, although it is a known fact that their available capacities are insufficiently used. Quite frequently the appearance of a new commodity is automatically related to the need to build new plants

and the mandatory purchase of equipment and machinery abroad, including some which could be produced at home.

For the past 20 years, automobile manufacturers have been speaking of converting to the use of diesel engines. However, they have done nothing of any substance to reorganize their huge production of engines with carburetors. Currently the share of trucks with diesel engines, including the output of the gigantic KamAZ, does not exceed 23 percent; only 1 percent of all buses have diesel engines. And all this takes place when diesel trucks predominate in today's foreign market and considerable amounts of passenger cars with diesel engines are being produced.

The restructuring of enterprises without new construction but merely by replacing equipment and keeping some production sites such as, for example, assembly shops, is quite profitable. The benefit here is not only the saving of capital funds through reconstruction but, even more important, the fact that the existing collective of workers, engineers and employees, established and trained, is already ready to carry out such assignments.

Let us note that replacing gasoline with diesel engines is consistent not only with export objectives but the country's domestic needs. This is not the only but, rather, a typical example pertaining to a number of export commodities.

It is the passive role played by Gosplan that affects above all delays in the solution of this problem, for without it neither the enterprises nor the Ministry of Automotive Industry as a whole can independently resolve the problem, for this requires the reorganization of the plant which, in turn, involves outlays for preparing production facilities, changes in the plan for the reconstruction period and financing. This cannot be avoided. Claims to the effect that it is possible to reorganize production by switching from one type of engine to another, "on the run," so to say, without interrupting output has not been confirmed by practical experience. However, the time for such reconstruction can be reduced by making preliminary preparations.

Attention should also be paid to the production of trucks as a major component of the export potential. Global production of such vehicles, based on load capacity, follows a perfectly clear trend. Most of the production program--75 percent--is for 2-ton or smaller trucks; 20 percent applies to 2-8-ton trucks; and 5 percent of the overall output involves trucks with a more than 8-ton capacity. All trucks have a variety of modifications and special features for the different models and sets of various trailers. However, the share of trucks with up to 2-ton capacity is insignificant in domestic production. It is one-half of the recommended figure and smaller by a factor of 6-8 compared to industrially highly developed capitalist countries.

The existence of a full range of trucks will enable us to increase their export and save the national economy unnecessary outlays which are caused by transporting small loads with high-capacity trucks. We know, for example, that in transporting freight weighing up to 1.5 tons in trucks with a 2.5-ton capacity increases hauling costs by 15 percent. And what about cases in which that same freight is hauled by a 5- or 8-ton truck?

A low-capacity truck will enable us to relieve a significant number of workers, or according to the specialists 30 to 50 percent of such trucks must be serviced by the driver who combines his profession with that of shipper, receiver, mailman, etc. Such is precisely the case in many countries.

The task of the industry producing export commodities includes mainly the development of series of machine engineering goods. This is governed by the requirements of the customers and the features of the market. Let us cite a few examples. In countries driving on the left side of the road the steering wheel is located on the right side. Significant differences exist in the power system: the frequency (50 or 60 Hz), tension and electric power require special types of engines, different safety requirements exist (such as three-prong plugs for television sets, washing machines and irons, etc.). Special requirements concerning packaging maritime and tropical conditions, etc., require additional outlays.

The greatest possible concern should be shown in the manufacturing of so-called tropical goods going to many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. This means special lining of power equipment wiring, special kinds of rubber, different seals, dyes and grounding and production technology.

In the case of railroad equipment, the different track sizes and loads per axle must be taken into consideration.

All accompanying documents, spare part catalogues and inscriptions on the machine units, instruments and machinery must be in the language of the purchasing country. Furthermore, we have the additional requirements of the consumer such as the layout of cabins in ships, work and sanitation premises, based on differences between foreign and Soviet standards. In building ships for foreign customers the various register stipulations must be taken into consideration (Lloyd, Veritas, etc.).

All of this requires additional outlays which, as a rule, are included in the price of the commodity and paid for by the customers. In the case of industry additional efforts are compensated with so-called export markups. Unfortunately, some "industrialists" believe that working for export means upgrading the quality. Reliability and quality must be identical for the foreign and domestic markets..

One of the important means of using the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution is the use of international experience. A world market in scientific and technical and practical production experience, which today has become a specific commodity, was established many years ago and is still in operation. The need for such experience is clear. "All nations can and must learn from others," Marx wrote (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 10).

Personal experience, even if quite substantial, is inevitably one-sided to a certain degree. Therefore, it must be enriched with the help of someone else's experience.



In 1982 payments for licenses in the world exceeded \$15 billion; the volume of licensed production of goods has been assessed at more than \$300 billion and the number of countries purchasing experience (licenses) exceeded 100. Today the purchasing of licenses has become an important means of resolving major technological problems, accelerating scientific and technical progress and establishing scientific and technical relations among countries with different social systems.

Such extensive borrowing of experience from other countries proves the fallacy of the viewpoint that importing licenses allegedly proves the technical backwardness of the purchasing country and damages its reputation. Statistical data on world trade in licenses indicates that payments for license purchases significantly exceed income from their sale in countries such as Italy, the FRG, France, Japan, The Netherlands, Sweden and others, which have a highly developed industry. Japan purchases more than it sells licenses by a factor of 3.1; the respective figures are more than double for France and Sweden and double for the FRG.

The Soviet Union began to purchase and sell licenses relatively recently and this area is developing although not so rapidly as one would wish. The psychological barrier of underestimating the significance of trade in licenses has not been surmounted everywhere and so far other shortcomings remain in this respect. Importing foreign technology and designs on the basis of licenses allows industry to save time and funds in resolving topical problems on a high technical level. It is a good foundation for further creative work and opens new horizons in the development of industrial production and the economy at large.

A classic example in this respect is the Volga Automotive Plant, the creation of which was based on international experience and the purchase of a significant number of licenses, know-how, etc. Its vehicles are in demand in a number of foreign (socialist and capitalist) countries and at home. The completion of the gigantic Volga Automotive Plant within a short time has been a major contribution to strengthening the Soviet Union's export potential.

Scientific research and experimental design (NIOKR) as an efficient means of upgrading the competitiveness of industrial output and, consequently, increasing the export possibilities and strengthening the foundations of the export potential, have become particularly important with the development of the scientific and technical revolution and the aggravation of economic rivalry among capitalist countries.

Every year a number of countries spend increasing funds for such purposes. The most expensive are science-intensive types of output, the share of which is steadily growing in exports. Such scientific research and experimental design work is oriented toward market requirements.

According to specialists, a new feature in the area of the NIOKR is the elaboration of comprehensive target programs for assisting in the production and export of specific usually science-intensive types of output. In accordance with such programs, state subsidies of private companies are not limited to the stage of scientific research; funds are allocated also for

market studies, further developments, testing, practical use of the commodity and even its marketing. This means that problems of production marketing, as one of the components of the cycle "from science to marketing and servicing" should not be considered secondary but organically related to and part of comprehensive programs. The Soviet Union has drafted 170 scientific and technical programs. They cover the main long-term trends in socialist construction. They also touch upon some export problems.

The undesirable feature of such programs from the foreign trade point of view is that they are formulated without paying proper attention to marketing and technical servicing in the case of machine building, for instance. Yet no complexes can be developed without said elements. Such problems should not be ignored, for they are directly related to the development of exports and, consequently, imports, i.e., toward the intensified utilization of the international division of labor and cooperation.

Technical servicing is the most important element of the export potential and requires the constant attention of machine producers and marketing organizations. Technical servicing of industrial machine goods is necessary everywhere. It covers the entire working life of the machine. However, this is also a very complex problem for the national economy and machine exports.

By 1 January 1984 more than 4.6 million motor vehicles, 550,000 tractors, 80,000 combines, 40,000 units of road construction machinery, more than 2,570 airplanes and helicopters, 2,000 ships and navigation facilities, 274,000 units of metal-processing equipment, 41,000 excavators, 4,300 diesel locomotives, 2,145,000 electric motors, 1,700 computers, 7.7 million still and motion picture cameras, more than 140 million timepieces, more than 9 million televisions and almost 13 million radio sets had been shipped abroad. Such a large number of goods makes the purchaser a demanding consumer rather than a pitiful petitioner for spare parts and various types of services. Yet, as in the past, many machine-building enterprises give priority to finished machine items rather than spare parts as they should. The lack of prompt deliveries of spare parts for motor vehicles, refrigerators, radio sets, and so on, frequently triggers negative feelings among our trading partners and is grounds for political opposition to cooperating with our country. The basis for such claims must be removed. Technical servicing must be competitive with no exception.

It would be suitable to this end to make use of international experience in technical servicing, above all the principles which govern its organization, rather than secondary details. Let us recall in this connection V. I. Lenin's words: "...Whoever undertakes to resolve individual problems without having resolved general ones will inevitably face such general problems subconsciously, at every step of the way" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 15, p 368).

It is precisely such common problems which are found in the principles governing the organization of technical services. Based on global experience, they are as follows: whoever produces must service; spare parts must be supplied as long as even a single machine is in operation; consumer requests based on variety, quantity and delivery times from all sources must be given

priority and full satisfaction, from the moment the item is removed from the main conveyor belt to assembling necessary spare parts and assemblies. Those who produce machine items and are responsible for the entire set of technical services are the first and main bearers of responsibility to the customer.

For example, with the help of presale servicing, the producer must deliver the machine in full working order and ready for immediate use.

What is particularly important is that such a system makes possible a feedback mechanism between the purchaser and the plant, which obtains and studies the most complete information as to the quality of the machines and takes steps to improve their design, technology and production control, repairability and reduced operation costs.

In the case of machine and equipment exports, the sale of spare parts is their most profitable item. Its effectiveness is 60 percent higher on an average than machine and equipment procurements. Technical servicing is an additional machine and equipment sector, which could become a source of additional income. Unfortunately, many of our economic managers still consider spare parts "a thing unto itself."

A properly organized technical servicing system is profitable both to the manufacturer and the customer, for it lowers outlays related to the use of the machines. Technical services are an area of the scientific and technical revolution and their organization are a substantial component of the country's export potential.

Soviet foreign trade organizations and industry have developed abroad a considerable network of service facilities. In the capitalist countries this is accomplished through commercial agents and the creation of mixed stockholding companies selling Soviet machines and equipment.

Currently 30 such stockholding companies operate abroad, covering the main export items, such as motor vehicles, tractors and agricultural machinery, metal-processing and electrical engineering equipment and consumer goods (timepieces, television sets, cameras, radio receivers, etc.). Such Soviet companies may be found in many different countries, such as Britain, Sweden, Finland, Belgium, France, Norway, Italy, Canada, the FRG, the United States, Australia and Denmark. They are properly familiar with the machine market and do good work.

Soviet technical centers have been established in the CEMA socialist countries, which assist in the organization of technical servicing.

Work on the foreign market requires a high degree of competence on the part of industrial and foreign trade personnel. The necessary specialized commercial organizations have been set up by the Ministry of Foreign Trade and the State Committee for Economic Cooperation to manage this area.

Foreign trade planning, which is concentrated within the USSR Gosplan, must be on a long-term basis with the allocation of fixed export volumes of goods in



demand on the foreign markets and contribute to the implementation of large-scale measures to adapt our goods to the market.

Some reserve capacities must be planned with a view to the rapid reorganization of production and machine-building enterprises. This is particularly important in the case of exports. Stimulating the moral and material features in industry is a strong factor in strengthening foreign trade. The procedure established in this area must be efficiently observed. No delays or halfway decisions should be allowed. In the final account, everything depends on the people and their interest in the work.

The creation of an export potential is closely related to the development of cooperation with various countries on the basis of mutually profitable conditions and is a factor in strengthening peace. Upgrading export possibilities is necessary in order to implement the long-term plans for cooperation with the socialist and CEMA member countries.

The development of the national economy has assumed a tremendous scope and a great deal has already been accomplished to strengthen the country's export potential. However, as Romain Rolland has pointed out, "one cannot win once and for all, one must win every day." A great deal remains to be done to increase the export possibilities of individual sectors and enterprises and make equally strong all links in the simple chain of development of the country's foreign exports. Anything as yet unaccomplished must be raised to the necessary level and to a state of total readiness for the successful presentation of our commodities on all markets. Unquestionably, attention will be paid to the steady development of the country's export potential. Constant concern for it will unquestionably contribute to the development of foreign trade and to resolving the problems set by the 26th CPSU Congress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## **STALWART SOLDIER OF LENIN'S GUARD**

Moscow **KOMMUNIST** in Russian No 14, Oct 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 49-58

[Article by M. Smirnov]

[Text] A telegram reporting that tsarist troops had fired at a peaceful worker march on Palace Square in Petersburg was received by the editors of **SEVERNYY KRAY**, a liberal newspaper published in Yaroslavl, on Monday, 10 January 1905. Distraught by the bloody events, the bolshevik V. R. Menzhinskiy, the editorial responsible secretary, immediately sat at his desk and wrote the article "Revolution in Petersburg." In reporting the number of victims of government arbitrariness and the erection of barricades on Vasilyevskiy Island, the author emphasized that "the workers, however, did not lay down their arms, they are still taking them up. The general workers' strike is continuing and strengthening and so is the will of the workers to gain their rights by force and to avenge the innocent blood of their brothers." The article ended with the calls "Long Live Socialism!", "Long Live the General Strike!" and "Down With the Tsar-Murderer!"

The bourgeois publishers of the newspaper objected to the publication of this militant political article. Furthermore, it would not have passed the censorship. Therefore, the article was printed as a leaflet in the clandestine press of the Northern RSDWP Committee and disseminated the following day in Yaroslavl and other cities in the Northern Industrial Rayon.

Several days later, Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich organized a secret meeting between the members of the Northern and Yaroslavl RSDWP committees. Menzhinskiy briefly reported on the revolutionary events which had developed in Russia, indicated the reasons which were restraining the development of the labor movement in the area and hindering the activities of the Northern Committee and expressed his considerations on what had to be done to promote political education and "to develop the class self-awareness and self-organization of the workers": in addition to the circles, to develop extensive agitation to prepare the workers for an open offensive on tsarism.

As they exchanged views, the committee members agreed on steps which would energize revolutionary activities: publication of leaflets, holding meetings and the creation of an agitation collegium to be headed by Menzhinskiy.

As early as 16 January, the first meeting was held at the Kruzhok Club, followed by a meeting-concert. At the beginning of February a worker meeting was held beyond the Volga but was dispersed by the police. Leaflets were disseminated. Militant political articles written by Menzhinskiy appeared in the newspaper SEVERNIY KRAY. The results of such social democratic activities were not slow in coming. A first wave of strikes broke out in February in Yaroslavl Guberniya, followed by a second in May. Throughout 1905 the revolutionary movement continued to grow. Menzhinskiy was one of its leaders. He had gained experience in party work while still in Petersburg. He began his revolutionary activity in 1895 as a propagandist in university and high school circles. After graduating from the law school of Petersburg University in 1898, he became a barrister in the Vyborg area and taught history at Smolensk in Sunday courses for workers beyond the Nevskaya barrier. According to worker V. F. Gorchakov, the people who taught such courses "openly introduced in their lessons revolutionary ideas" and recruited the most suitable people in the social democratic circles. In recalling his propaganda work, Menzhinskiy himself wrote that between 1897 and 1907 he lectured on the Erfurt program of the German social democratic movement, Marx's "Das Kapital" and Russian history and took part in the work of 15 clandestine circles.

... The ISKRA organization was set up in St. Petersburg at the end of 1901. Menzhinskiy joined it. On 15 September 1902 the Petersburg committee accepted him as RSDWP member and soon afterwards he was entrusted with heading the party committee of Nevskiy Rayon. Menzhinskiy received his baptism of fire as a professional revolutionary among the Peter proletariat.

At that time, V. I. Lenin and the ISKRA he headed were rallying under the Marxist banners the forces of the Russian revolutionary social democrats. Menzhinskiy was made representative of the ISKRA organization in Yaroslavl. Together with other consistent Marxist revolutionaries, he rebuilt the "Northern Worker Alliance," which had been routed by the secret police, and organized its work and contacts with the ISKRA editors. The "Northern Alliance" became Lenin's reliable support in the period of preparations for the Second Party Congress. "...The 'Northern Alliance' alone," N. K. Krupskaya said at the congress, "immediately established friendly relations with ISKRA."

The "Northern Alliance," which was reorganized as the Northern Committee after the Second RSDWP Congress, actively struggled, together with its local organizations, against the mensheviks and for Lenin's organizational and tactical principles and the holding of a third party congress. With Menzhinskiy's active participation, on three occasions--in August, September and October 1904--the committee expressed in its documents lack of confidence in the menshevik central committee. It approved and supported Lenin's activities in the preparations for the congress. In February 1905, with the participation of Ya. M. Sverdlov, who had come to Yaroslavl, and V. R. Menzhinskiy, the Northern Committee once again discussed the problem. Noting in its resolution that the mensheviks are "wrecking the party's constructive activities," he instructed the majority committee bureaus to convene a congress "which should put an end to the internecine quarrel and resolve problems which had appeared in the last years of the struggle waged by the proletariat against autocracy and capital."



The Third Party Congress, which took place in April 1905, dealt with the basic problems of the starting revolution and defined the tasks of the proletariat as its leader. It acknowledged the organization of the armed uprising as the main and urgent party and working class task. During that period Menzhinskiy was one of the leaders of the revolutionary actions of the workers in the Upper Volga. The Yaroslavl bolsheviks engaged in extensive agitation also among soldiers in the Yaroslavl and Rostov garrisons.

Realizing the need for bolshevik work in the army and drawing the troops over on the side of the revolution was one of the lessons learned from the armed uprising in Moscow. That is why the party gave Menzhinskiy, who had returned to Petrograd, a new and most important assignment. He became a member of the capital's committee of the Military Organization of the RSDWP and editor of the KAZARMA newspaper. The Military Organization engaged in active agitation among the soldiers of the Petersburg garrison and the Kronshtadt seamen.

Spontaneous disturbances broke out among the soldiers and sailors in the garrison of Sveaborg fortress (Finland) in the summer of 1906. They were supported by the SR, who considered the armed uprising as no more than a military conspiracy, a rebellion separated from the struggle waged by the masses. They appealed for uprising. The local military social democratic organization, in which bolshevik Second Lt. A. P. Yemel'yanov and B. L. Kokhanskiy played a noted role, deemed preparations for an armed uprising incomplete and opposed immediate action. On Lenin's initiative, the Petersburg Party Committee sent a delegation to Sveaborg, instructed to postpone the uprising or, should this prove to be impossible, most actively to participate in leading the movement (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 13, p 328).

A decision was also made to distribute among the troops a special issue of the newspaper KAZARMA. Menzhinskiy wrote the appeal, which took an entire notebook. The KAZARMA editors and several committee members met to discuss and edit the final draft of the document. However, they were betrayed by a provocateur. Menzhinskiy had barely begun to read the text when policemen rushed into the apartment. He coolly took off his jacket, having put the notebook in one of the inside pockets, and neatly hung it on the back of the chair. In the course of the search no one paid attention to the jacket and when the detainees were led out of the premises, Menzhinskiy calmly put his jacket on. Along the way he was able to throw the notebook out of the window of the prison van and thus get rid of the primary piece of evidence.

During the investigation, Menzhinskiy, who was kept in solitary, went on a hunger strike. He was able to prevail in his stubborn and long confrontation with his jailers. He was freed for lack of evidence and thus was able to avoid a trial and forced labor. Hiding from the police, Menzhinskiy went to Finland. It was there that, under Lenin's guidance, he participated in the publication of the newspaper PROLETARIY. Subsequently, by decision of the bolshevik center, he left for Western Europe.

This forced exile lasted 10 long years. For a while, Menzhinskiy lived in Belgium, then in Switzerland and France. He paid short visits to Italy, the

United States and Britain to study the labor movement. Away from the homeland, he was unable immediately to understand the nature of Lenin's tactics under the conditions of Stolypin's reaction. For a short while he joined the VPERED factional group. However, Lenin's criticism of this left sectarian movement brought his short delusion to an end and as early as the spring of 1911 Menzhinskiy broke with the VPERED supporters and joined the bolshevik ranks firmly, decisively and irreversibly.

Abroad, Menzhinskiy engaged essentially in the study of Marxism and socioeconomic and philosophical subjects. "I read more or less everything published in Marxist theory until 1917," he was to recall subsequently. He also studied Oriental languages at the Sorbonne. He spoke fluently the main European languages--French, German and English. Toward the end of his life Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich had learned 19 languages.

In the summer of 1917, following the overthrow of tsarism, Menzhinskiy returned to Petrograd. As instructed by the party, he started work in its military organization. He was a member of the Voenka Bureau and edited the newspaper SOLDAT.

The Sixth RSDWP(b) Congress formulated the party's course of armed uprising and socialist revolution. During the period of preparations for the overthrow of the bourgeois Provisional Government, Menzhinskiy was member of the military-revolutionary committee of the Petrograd Soviet. He systematically pursued in the Military Organization bureau a course of immediate implementation of the 10 and 16 October party Central Committee resolutions on armed uprisings prior to the opening of the Second Congress of Soviets.

On the night of 25 October the military-revolutionary committee appointed Menzhinskiy its commissar at the Ministry of Finance. Carrying a mandate signed by N. I. Podvoyskiy, he immediately took off for the barracks of the Pavlovskiy regiment; from there, accompanied by a detachment of soldiers and Red Army men, he went to the main office of the State Bank on Yekateriniskiy Canal (today Griboyedov Canal). By 6 am the rebels occupied the bank, and then by the main treasury and the state documents office. In the afternoon of 25 October, accompanied by a detachment of Red Army men, Menzhinskiy went to the Ministry of Finance at 43 Moyka. Accompanied by an official, he entered the minister's office.

The comrade (deputy) minister who appeared soon afterwards summoned the ministry officials and suggested that they ignore the commissar's orders. It was thus that the resistance of finance employees to the new Soviet system began. Finances could be put in the service of the people only by eliminating the sabotage, which is what Menzhinskiy undertook to do.

The Second Congress of Soviets passed the decrees on peace, land and power and set up the Soviet government--the Council of People's Commissars. I. I. Skvortsov-Stepanov, who was in Moscow at that time, was made people's commissar of finance. A number of factors prevented him from coming to Petrograd and on 30 October 1917 Lenin signed a decree appointing Menzhinskiy temporary people's commissar of the Ministry of Finance. The same day a Ministry of Finance order, signed by Lenin and Menzhinskiy, was published,

demanding of the personnel in financial institutions to put an end to their sabotage. "The employees' strike," the order read, "is inadmissible. Starting tomorrow, 31 October, work in all ministry institutions must begin at the usual time. Should the strike continue in any Ministry of Finance office, its chief will be arrested immediately."

The same day the Sovnarkom passed a decree signed by Lenin and Menzhinskiy according to which all banks were to open on 31 October.

Under Vladimir Il'ich's guidance, Menzhinskiy did a tremendous amount of work to eliminate the old bourgeois financial system and create a new socialist one. By taking decisive steps, which included the detention of Shipov, the former state bank manager, the bolsheviks were able to eliminate the officials' sabotage, to take over the State Bank and thus to assume control over private bank activities. In emphasizing the significance of this step, Lenin wrote that "...control of banks...would enable us to establish actual control over all economic life and the production and distribution of most important commodities...." (op. cit., vol 34, p 163). The efforts of the bankers to avoid Soviet governmental control hastened the nationalization of private banks. All other valuables were taken over and concentrated within a single state repository. The land bank of the agrarians was closed down. A single national bank began to operate in the country. By nationalizing the private banks and establishing state monopoly on banking, the Soviet system undermined the economic power of the bourgeoisie and the nobility. At the same time, it denounced all the foreign debts contracted by the tsarist and provisional governments and liberated the Russian working people from financial slavery to international capital.

Within a very short time--no more than 2 months--guided by Lenin, the bolsheviks created a new financial system. The Ministry of Finance was closed down. A collegium and a new apparatus of the People's Commissariat of Finance were created, headed by V. R. Menzhinskiy, the first Soviet people's commissar of finance. It was with his direct participation that the 1918 state budget, the first in Russian history to be published in the press, was drafted and approved by the government.

During the period of sharp struggle against sabotage and counterrevolution, on 21 December 1917 Menzhinskiy was made member of the recently created All-Russian Extraordinary Commission (VChK). In March 1918, in the course of a discussion of the deployment of party forces prior to moving the Soviet government to Moscow, the party's Central Committee decided that Menzhinskiy should remain in his leading position in Petrograd. During those most difficult days for the Soviet system he dedicated all his efforts to his work in the Petrograd combat center of the ~~Cheka~~ and the Commissariat of Justice of the Petrograd Labor Commune.

Following the conclusion of the Brest Peace Treaty, as a highly educated person with a broad political outlook, Menzhinskiy was appointed Soviet consul general of the RSFSR in Berlin. With his typical energy and persistence, he defended the interests of the young Soviet republic in that position and actively struggled for strengthening peace, organizing trade and economic



relations with Germany and working for the fastest possible return of Russian prisoners of war to the homeland.

Lenin demanded of the Soviet diplomats in Berlin to try to interest German business circles in economic cooperation with Russia. If German merchants would find economic advantages in reciprocal trade, he emphasized in a letter to Menzhinskiy, "your policy would continue to be successful" (see op. cit., vol 50, p 88). Armed with Lenin's mandates, Menzhinskiy participated in the work of the Russian-German Political Commission and engaged in Berlin in talks with a Finnish delegation on concluding a peace treaty between Soviet Russia and Finland.

The successful completion of talks on basic political problems contributed to the development of trade cooperation between the two countries. After lengthy talks with representatives of German business circles and with the approval of the Soviet government, Menzhinskiy concluded in Berlin a big commercial deal on the purchasing of coal and coke and initialed a commercial navigation protocol.

In November 1918, on the eve of its breakdown under the strikes of the growing bourgeois-democratic revolution, the German imperial government broke off diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia. Our diplomats were forced to leave Berlin. Menzhinskiy returned to Moscow, where he was appointed member of the collegium of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs. In that position he carried out a number of assignments of the party's Central Committee. As member of the Soviet delegation, he participated in the talks on the withdrawal of German troops from occupied territories in Belorussia and the Ukraine and, subsequently, in the talks with the Ukrainian Directorate.

After the victory of the October Revolution, the combined forces of the domestic and foreign counterrevolution made consistent efforts to overthrow the Soviet system and restore the bourgeois-landowning regime. A civil war broke out in the country. In order to defend the revolutionary gains of the people, Lenin and the Communist Party implemented a number of extraordinary measures. "A revolution," Lenin said, "is worth anything only if it is able to defend itself..." (op. cit., vol 37, p 122). By party decision, organs for the struggle against the counterrevolution and the intervention were created--the VChK and the Red Army. The best, the firmest battle-tempered bolshevik cadres, including personnel of the Military Organization, were assigned to their ranks. Menzhinskiy was one of them.

"Ascribing particular importance to preserving the gains of the October Revolution," Yu. V. Andropov pointed out, "the party's Central Committee assigned tried cadres to work in the VChK. Its first chairman was Feliks Edmundovich Dzerzhinskiy, a noted party leader and loyal Leninist, who had gone through the harsh school of clandestinity, tsarist jail and hard labor, a man infinitely loyal to the revolution and merciless toward its enemies. At different periods, outstanding party leaders worked in the VChK, such as V. R. Menzhinskiy, M. S. Uritskiy, Ya. Kh. Peters, M. S. Kedrov, I. K. Ksenofontov and many others. They were the bolshevik nucleus of the Cheka organs."

In April 1919, after discussing problems of strengthening the country's defense, the RKP(b) Central Committee Plenum decided to appoint Menzhinskiy chief of the political department of the republic's revolutionary military council. One month later, as a result of the critical situation which had developed at the front, the Central Committee assigned him to the Ukraine. Menzhinskiy became a member of the Small Sovnarkom of the Ukrainian Republic, where he assumed the position of deputy people's commissar of the Soviet socialist inspectorate. He visited the front-line area as special representative of the Council of the Worker-Peasant Defense of the Ukrainian SSR. That same June, by decision of the KP(b)U Central Committee Politburo, he became member of the Ukrainian Cheka Collegium.

In September 1919, when the resistance of the class enemy had intensified even further throughout the country, the party sent Menzhinskiy to work in the Special Department of the VChK and the Revolutionary Military Council, which was fighting espionage and counterrevolution within the Red Army and Navy. At that time the VChK was investigating the "National Center" conspiracy while the Special Department was investigating the "Staff of the Voluntary Army of the Moscow Area," a clandestine military organization.

Menzhinskiy immediately plunged into operative-investigative work. The artillery courses physician mentioned the active role which former tsarist Colonel Miller, at that time the commander of these courses, played in the conspiracy. From his talk with the physician in the premises of the VChK, Menzhinskiy learned that Miller had turned to the republic's Revolutionary Military Council with the request to assign artillery weapons for the courses and a motorcycle for his own use. The same day, by joint decision of the leaderships of the VChK and the Revolutionary Military Council, and on behalf of the latter, Miller was assigned a motorcycle driven by a Chekist.

Surveillance of Miller's travels led to a discovery of the address and names of the conspirators, specifically that of the chief of staff of the clandestine military organization. A search of the latter's apartment revealed important documents which established the guilt of the conspirators in preparing an armed mutiny in Moscow. The VChK had at its disposal other documents as well, according to which the action was planned for 22 September 1919. On 18 September Dzerzhinskiy informed the party's Central Committee "about the action which the White Guards were preparing in Moscow."

On the night of 19 September the VChK and the Special Department started their operation to eliminate the conspiratorial organization. F. T. Fomin, who was working in the special section at that time, recalls that on the night of the operation he was summoned by F. E. Dzerzhinskiy. Chekists came into his office. V. R. Menzhinskiy gave them the order to detain the conspirators and formulated the assignment clearly. He was brief. He told them to be cautious and asked if everything was clear. The operation involved the participation of armed detachments of Moscow workers and special assignment units (ChON). In a 2-day period the "National Center" armed organization was liquidated and the conspirators arrested. On 21 September Dzerzhinskiy reported the successful completion of the operation at a meeting of the RKP(b) Central Committee session.

Revolutionary experience, his special training acquired at the university law school, profound knowledge of the situation both at home and abroad and the skill of party conspiratorial activities enabled Menzhinskiy, as comrades who knew him well noted, to use a broad political perspective in his struggle against the counterrevolution. Working side by side with Dzerzhinskiy, the "knight of the revolution," Menzhinskiy became one of the most prestigious leaders of the VChK. He was made member of the VChK collegium and appointed deputy chairman of the special department which Dzerzhinskiy had been heading since the summer of 1919.

In July 1920, when the party assigned Dzerzhinskiy to the Polish front, Menzhinskiy became the chairman of this most important VChK subunit. He was asked to maintain "contacts with the Central Committee on political matters" and "to report systematically to the Central Committee on the most important cases of political, economic and party significance."

Toward the end of 1919 and in 1920 the Chekists exposed the conspiratorial network of the "Tactical Center." This was a pan-Russian association of monarchists, Kadets, Savinkovites and defeated agents of foreign espionage centers. By defeating attempts at anti-Soviet actions by the domestic and foreign counterrevolution, the VChK organs ensured tranquility in the Soviet rear, thus enabling the Red Army to perform its combat tasks at the front.

In noting the merits of the VChK in strengthening the Soviet system, at the 9th All-Russian Congress of Soviets Lenin said that "...it was this institution which was our striking weapon aimed at the innumerable conspiracies and attempts against the Soviet system by people who were infinitely stronger than we were.... The only possible answer to them was repression, merciless, fast and instantaneous, based on the sympathy of the workers and peasants. This was the merit of our VChK" (op. cit., vol 44, p 327).

Even after the end of the civil war, Menzhinskiy did not break his close ties with the Red Army: he regularly visited defense enterprises and units, attended military exercises and headed military counterintelligence, which protected the armed forces of the land of the soviets from penetration by enemy agents. Well familiar with the situation in the army and making his contribution to its steady strengthening, he was convinced that should international reaction resume the war the Soviet troops would inflict a crushing defeat on the enemy. In the OGPU order issued on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Red Army he wrote that "...if the imperialists advance on the USSR to overthrow the Soviet system the Red Army will be able to counter tanks with tanks and guns with guns and, under VKP(b) leadership, ensure the victory of socialism."

After the interventionists and the White Guard were expelled from Soviet soil, the party focused its main attention on resolving economic problems and restoring the national economy destroyed by the war. Under the new circumstances it set new requirements to the state security organs. Forces which were doing everything possible to wreck the building of a socialist society and turn Soviet Russia back to the old bourgeois system still remained within the country and abroad. Under those circumstances, the state security



organs had to block all attempts by hostile centers to send into our country spies and saboteurs and, together with the entire people, eliminate all that hindered the constructive toil of the Soviet people.

First of all, at Lenin's suggestion, the party reorganized the VChK in accordance with the new situation. Based on the resolutions of the 11th RKP(b) Conference and in accordance with the All-Union Central Executive Committee 6 February 1922 Decree, Dzerzhinskiy and Menzhinskiy took most active part in the reorganization of the VChK into the State Political Administration (GPU) under the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs, whose tasks included the struggle against spies, the counterrevolution and banditry. In July of the same year, the Sovnarkom appointed Menzhinskiy member of the GPU collegium and, in September 1923, first deputy chairman of the Joint State Political Administration (OGPU) of the Council of People's Commissars, which had jurisdiction over the republic GPUs.

The changes affected not only the name and the form but, above all, the methods of work. "Above and more than anything else, the Cheka is organ of the struggle against the counterrevolution," Menzhinskiy wrote. "Therefore, it cannot remain unchanged under the changed ratio of warring classes..., such as, for example, in converting from war to peacetime or vice versa...." To the VChK-GPU leadership the most important was the fact that "the new form of VChK organization and its new means and approaches, such as a conversion from mass strikes to detailed investigations of counterrevolutionary circles...attain as in the past its main objective--the defeat and routing of the counterrevolution."

Menzhinskiy most actively participated in the elaboration of the new means and methods of struggle against the class enemy. At one point Dzerzhinskiy had said that during his work in the VChK-OGPU he had come across no operative worker stronger than Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich. According to Dzerzhinskiy, from the moment signals were received by the Cheka, he was able to determine whether this was something truly serious or not worth bothering with. This was a manifestation of Menzhinskiy's tremendous revolutionary experience and his party-oriented and truly creative approach to the investigation of any phenomenon in social life.

The elaboration and implementation of Operation Trust, with Menzhinskiy's personal participation, was an example of such creative approach. A clandestine monarchic organization had been discovered in 1921. While preserving its outward appearance, the GPU used this organization as a cover for penetrating foreign anti-Soviet centers. The operation took 5 years. It resulted in disarming dangerous enemies of the Soviet system, such as B. Savinkov and S. Reilly, a British intelligence agent, who had been a member of the Lockhart 1918 conspiracy. Menzhinskiy and other active participants in this brilliant operation were presented with the highest award of that time--the Order of the Red Banner.

Following the death of F. E. Dzerzhinskiy, the tireless communist fighter, in July 1926, the party entrusted Menzhinskiy with the position of OGPU chairman, a position he held for the remainder of his life.

After the civil war, the enemies of the Soviet system relied mainly on terrorism. In the period when the communist party had undertaken the country's industrialization and collectivization, the enemy's principal methods were sabotage and subversion. The years passed, the methods used by the enemy changed and so did the names of anti-Soviet organizations, but their objectives remained the same: undermining the foundations of the Soviet system, destroying socialism and restoring capitalism.

During that period the OGPU organs, headed by Menzhinskiy, eliminated a subversive counterrevolutionary organization in the Donbass (the "Shakhtinskoye affair"), exposed the "Prompartiya" conspiracy, struck at the kulak "Labor Peasant Party" and terminated the activities of the menshevik "Union RSDWP Bureau." The OGPU exposed the criminal actions of foreign saboteurs and spies, who engaged in subversive actions under the cover of German (Siemens-Schuckert and Broun-Bovery), British (Metro-Vickers and Pitler) and American (General Electric Company) companies. The enemy's reliance on subversion and sabotage was defeated.

Menzhinskiy's talents as a party and state leader were revealed most fully in his position as chairman of the OGPU. Experience in party work, revolutionary zeal, extensive education, organizational talent, crystal pure honesty and modesty earned him the most profound respect of party members and all Soviet people--workers, peasants and Red Army troops. According to V. V. Kuybyshev, Menzhinskiy was "loved by all working people."

Menzhinskiy, who accepted unconditionally the party's leadership of the state security organs, relied in his Chekist work above all on the working class, with which he was connected from the very beginning of his revolutionary activities. V. Gerson, his secretary and deputy administrator of affairs of the OGPU, wrote that Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich "maintained close ties with the working class and the toiling masses.... His ties with the toiling masses, which had been established during the very first years of his revolutionary activities, became an organic component of his entire life.... Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich repeatedly visited plants, Moscow Plant No 39 in particular, which was named after him." Menzhinskiy was always concerned with the strict observance of socialist legality by OGPU organs. He demanded this in his orders and speeches to Chekists. According to M. Shklyar, former OGPU party organization secretary, in instructing the operative workers about to engage in Chekist operations, Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich cautioned them as follows: "Remember that we are fighting for the person and that the entire meaning of the revolution is the person. That is why you must be cautious in your searches and detentions. Remember that there are also families and children."

As F. Lengnik recalls, V. R. Menzhinskiy "was strikingly delicate in addressing the people. He created the impression of a tremendously cultured person, profoundly honest, with a great deal of knowledge and practical experience..., a person of amazing willpower and persistence. Whatever Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich undertook to do he planned most thoroughly and invariably carried out.... He knew people, he knew how to organize and deploy them, how to use and value them."

The appearance he presented as an always controlled, calm person concealed the passionate revolutionary nature of a fighter with an inflexible will of steel. Menzhinskiy's contemporaries say that it was precisely for his passionate revolutionism and inflexible will as a fighter that Lenin valued him highly.

The struggle against enemy agents and the internal counterrevolution and the tremendous efforts which Menzhinskiy dedicated to strengthening the state security organs and the border troops and to instilling in Chekist activities the Leninist principles of socialist legality absorbed his entire life. According to his fellow workers, Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich had virtually no private life.

However, years of clandestine activities and foreign exile and intensive struggle and work had undermined Menzhinskiy's health. He was sick for many years, closely hiding from his comrades his physical suffering. Occasionally, the party's Central Committee had to interfere to remove Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich, already stricken by heavy infirmities, from his work. One such case occurred in the summer of 1921. Finding out from Unshlikht that Menzhinskiy was sick, on 7 July Lenin wrote the Central Committee: "After a talk with Unshlikht I suggest to the Central Committee to decree the following:

"To order Comrade Menzhinskiy to go on leave and rest immediately and until physicians have issued him a health certificate in writing. Until then he should not come more than 2-3 times weekly and for 2-3 hours at a time. Lenin" (op. cit., vol 53, p 13).

Such was also the case in 1929, when Menzhinskiy disobeyed the physicians and continued to work after an infarct. On that occasion, the following special resolution was promulgated by the Central Committee on 12 September: "Concerning Comrade Menzhinskiy:

"Comrade Menzhinskiy is ordered to obey the doctors' instructions precisely."

Despite the further aggravation of his illness, Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich continued to work intensively. He died on 10 May 1934.

In rendering due respect to V. R. Menzhinskiy's services, his comrades and fellow fighters and members of the OGPU collegium noted the following: "Incredibly modest and mercilessly exigent toward himself, full of courageous self-denial, Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich was a model proletarian fighter, who had dedicated the entire power of his tremendous revolutionary temperament to the cause of fighting the enemies of the proletarian revolution. His sharp and fine mind had the ability to expose promptly the secret springs of the treacherous work of the enemies of proletarian dictatorship. With the greatest presence of mind and an iron bolshevik firmness, our deceased teacher and friend, under the direct leadership of our party's Central Committee...organized the struggle for strengthening the Soviet state and securing revolutionary order..."

As OGPU chairman Menzhinskiy was invariably guided in his work by the ideas and resolutions of the communist party. He always relied on the close ties



between the state security organs and the working class. The essence of Chekist work, he emphasized, is the unbreakable ties with the party and the masses. In his words, the communist party's guidance and the strict and precise implementation of the directives of its Central Committee were the source of strength of the state security organs. As member of the Central Control Commission and, after the 15th Congress, of the Central Committee, along with the Leninist party nucleus he waged an irreconcilable and uncompromising struggle against "left-wing" and right-wing opposition and for strengthening the unity within party ranks.

In assigning the leadership of the state security organs and the struggle against the intrigues of the international counterrevolution to such tried fighters for the cause of communism as F. E. Dzerzhinskiy and V. R. Menzhinskiy, the party established the great Leninist traditions of work by the Soviet Chekists which, asserting and developing themselves, remain alive to this day.

"The task of the Chekists," Comrade K. U. Chernenko has pointed out, "is reliably to ensure the safety of the Soviet fatherland and to organize their work in accordance with the requirements of democracy, the laws of our state of the whole people and the foreign political situation. This work must be based on the inviolable foundation of the Leninist principles and in the spirit of the outstanding Chekist tradition."

The life of Vyacheslav Rudol'fovich Menzhinskiy is inseparable from the history of the Leninist party. The revolutionary epoch formulated its exceptionally strict requirements to the proletarian fighters, developing in them special character features, while the organization of the professional revolutionaries--the Bolshevik Party--polished and sharpened these features in the daily battles for the cause of the working class. The outstanding and active life of V. R. Menzhinskiy, the fiery revolutionary, firm soldier in the Leninist guard and irreconcilable fighter against the counterrevolution and active builder of socialism in our country is an outstanding example for the new generations of Soviet people, who are building a communist society.

His memory lives in the party and the entire Soviet people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## OUR REPUBLIC IS A STATE OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 59-67

[Article by Erich Honecker, SED Central Committee general secretary and GDR State Council chairman. Article published in EINHEIT, the SED Central Committee journal for the theory and practice of scientific socialism, Nos 9-10, 1984]

[Text] Thirty-five years have passed since 7 October 1949, the day the German Democratic Republic was founded, and a new stage in the life of our people began. For the first time a state of workers and peasants appeared on German soil and the foundations for the creation of the type of society in which a person can truly be a person were laid. The founding of our republic was the result of the radical changes which had taken place in the international arena as a result of the victory of the Soviet Union and the other members of the anti-Hitlerite coalition over German fascism.

From whatever viewpoint we may consider social phenomena and events, it is history that passes final judgment on them. In the course of 35 years, the GDR has developed successfully as a state of peace and socialism and as an effective factor of stability and security on the European continent. Rising from the wreckage and aspiring to the future, it covered the difficult path of labor and struggle. The achieved results continued to serve the good of the people. They also prove that the republic has always fulfilled its international duty.

### Turning Point in the History of Our People and Europe

Entire generations of honest Germans dreamed of a new, peace-loving Germany, free from exploitation and oppression, which would be the friend of all nations. They struggled for this without sparing their lives. Their behests have been honored in the GDR, where the aspirations of the best sons and daughters of the German people have become reality. Our state has firmly assumed its position in the socialist world, the world of true freedom, democracy and human dignity. It is forever linked with ties of fraternity with the Soviet Union as a firm structural component of the socialist community. It is actively pursuing a policy of anti-imperialist solidarity. Solemnly and loudly the GDR said at the time of its birth "no to fascism!"

Henceforth no war should ever break out on German soil!" It has pursued its policy accordingly.

Life itself and inevitable facts convincingly prove that the founding of the GDR became a turning point in the history of our people and Europe. On German soil as well, for the first time the working people became the masters of their destiny. The ideas of the creators of scientific socialism and of the immortal doctrine of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin, who continued their cause, became social reality in the homeland of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Imperialism has lost forever an area it once dominated unchallenged. This has been one of its greatest defeats. Guided by the SED, allied with the peasantry, the intelligentsia and all working people, in the past 35 years the working class has performed a constructive task of historical significance. The comradely interaction among parties and mass organizations rallied within the GDR National Front, was fully justified. Convincing proof was supplied to the effect that, while guaranteeing the interests of all citizens, regardless of social origin, outlook and religious belief, the socialist society offers them extensive opportunities for creative participation in resolving social problems on the basis of socialist democracy. The peaceful and constructive toil of man has never been so honored and respected on German soil as it is in the GDR.

Today our country is one of the industrially most advanced states in the world with a modern educational system and a steady development of science and culture. Its defense is always on the proper level. The GDR is an equal and active member of the United Nations and its specialized organizations. It has diplomatic relations with 131 countries throughout the world.

From the very first day of its existence, socialist Germany has considered preserving and ensuring a durable peace a primary task to the implementation of which it has dedicated all its forces. Disarmament, detente and peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems have always been and remain its main political objectives. The GDR has always considered peace and making a constructive contribution to the joint efforts of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries its most important objective. This is dictated not only by the experience of two world wars but, above all, the fact that our country is located at the meeting point of socialism and capitalism in Europe and the line separating the two largest military political alliances--the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

During all this time the GDR had systematically opposed the efforts of right-wing forces in the West, the FRG in particular, to question the results of World War II and postwar developments. We ascribe major importance to this struggle, for the results of World War II and the postwar system are exceptionally important in resolving the main problem of our time--securing peace on earth. For 35 years the struggle for the successful development of the GDR has always been a struggle against revanchism.

#### The Results of Our Forward Revolutionary Movement

As they celebrate their national holiday, the people of the GDR sum up the results which instill pride in our accomplishments in building socialism and



the struggle for peace. To us they are a source of strength and confidence that we shall be able in the future as well successfully to implement the domestic and foreign program drafted by the 10th SED Congress. More than ever before the party and the people are closely interlinked with the ties of profound reciprocal trust. This was manifested with particular clarity in the communal elections of 6 May 1984, when the voters unanimously cast their votes for the candidates of the National Front. The participation of the citizens in the election was the most active in the entire history of the GDR and their results were the best for such elections for the past 10 years.

The national youth festival of the Union of Free German Youth was held last 9-10 June. On that occasion the results of the competition, which had developed under the banner of strengthening peace and in the course of which outstanding labor victories were achieved, were summed up. The festival turned into an impressive mass demonstration of support for the party's policy by the young men and women of our country. The young generation reasserted its readiness to strengthen the socialist state and to defend it from any encroachments.

As we look at the distance we have covered, we see the bright picture of the profound changes which have taken place in the life of the people. Within a historically short time, in the course of a steady revolutionary process, antifascist-democratic changes were made, the foundations for socialism were laid, the rule of socialist production relations was asserted and the building of a developed socialist society was initiated. We are continuing systematically to implement this policy in accordance with the resolutions of the 10th Party Congress.

By the time our republic was founded, in the course of putting into the hands of the people the decisive productive capital, the exploitation of man by man had been essentially eliminated. This freed the working people from the vice of capitalist cyclical crises and eliminated the roots of wars. Public ownership of productive capital, the use of which became increasingly efficient as the planned economy improved, became the foundation for a steady and powerful economic upsurge. Its results increasingly benefitted the working people themselves. This socialist feature became particularly clear from the start of the 1970s, when the means of building a developed socialist society were comprehensively charted. Taking a course toward resolving the main problem of building socialism on the basis of a unified economic and social policy, the party raised social progress to a new qualitatively higher stage.

The successful changes which were accomplished in all fields of life were made possible by the fact that, guided by the universally applicable laws of socialist construction, the SED is creatively applying them under the specific circumstances of our country. In following this path we have always been able to resolve the complex problems of growth which lead the country to socialism.

From the very beginning the building of our worker-peasant state took place under the conditions of a fierce and frequently greatly aggravated international class struggle. The state was able honorably to withstand all trials. The Marxist-Leninist policy of the SED and the close ties between party and people are the reliable shield against which all possible political,

economic and ideological strategies and tactics of the enemy failed. Although this struggle occasionally complicated the progress of our country, the enemy was never able to hinder or even halt it. In this struggle the GDR always relied on its reliance with the USSR and the other fraternal countries.

In summing up the overall results, we can say that throughout the 35 years of the existence of the GDR the working class and its allies confidently led our country on the path of socialism and resolved all problems in the interest of man, of the working people. The successes achieved in building a developed socialist society prove with particular clarity the advantages of the new system. The alliance between the working class and the peasantry, the intelligentsia and the other toiling strata was manifested throughout all the stages of work and struggle as a great force. The social rapprochement among classes and strata of our people took place in the progress of production forces and socialist production relations. Major disparities between town and country and between physical and mental work increasingly disappeared.

The creative and conscientious activities of many generations are embodied in the establishment and development of the GDR. The contribution of all classes and strata to building socialism and the accomplishments of the youth and the members of the senior generation, the labor veterans in particular, who helped to lay the foundations of the state of workers and peasants, earned high social recognition.

Thanks to the practical experience acquired by the people and the party's ideological work, the moral and political unity of our people continued to strengthen. Marxism-Leninism became the dominant ideology. The SED has always considered ideological work the main feature of its activities aimed at harnessing the creative activeness of the masses. We must take into consideration in this case the fact that in our country a socialist society is being built under the conditions of a country open to the rest of the world and that we are under the constant influence of three Western television and numerous radio stations which broadcast in German. The GDR mass media and every party member in his work sector are engaged in daily ideological struggle. The love of the people for their socialist fatherland and their inviolable friendship with the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries are strengthening in the course of the ideological confrontation. Our party considers this a vitally important prerequisite for the successful building of socialism.

#### The Economy Is the Work of Human Hands and Is for the Sake of Man

The economy is the main area in which social policy is implemented. Neither satisfying material and cultural needs more and more fully nor strengthening the socialist state and reliably protecting its security are possible without intensive economic growth. The world of the 1980s offers ever new proofs of the relevance of Lenin's words concerning the decisive role of labor productivity in the struggle between the two social systems. The perfecting of a socialist planned economy and increased economic efficiency must always remain in the center of attention.

This is particularly important under the conditions of building a mature socialist society, when national economic processes are increasingly determined by a conversion to intensive expanded reproduction. More than ever before economic plans and computations are based on improved ratios between results and outlays. Upgrading efficiency becomes a direct prerequisite for economic development which today must be increasingly secured by scientific and technical progress and its economic results. The party's policy, concentrated in the economic strategy approved at the 10th SED Congress, takes this fact into consideration and provides new conditions for considerable growth rates. In the course of the changes related to a conversion to extensive intensification, the party has always tried to find long-term solutions based on a planned socialist economy and which, in turn, are aimed at its development. The creation of a system of combines is one of the most important new examples of this process.

The high pace and continuity of the economic upsurge for the past several decades can be unquestionably considered a confirmation of the creative consideration of the requirements of objective socialist economic laws. In the year of its founding, the GDR's national income was 24.1 billion marks which, bearing in mind the consequences of the postwar dislocation was, unquestionably, a significant accomplishment. The 1983 national income reached 210.1 billion marks, or an increase by a factor of almost 9. The 1949 per capita income was 1,274 marks compared to 12,580 marks in 1983. Our republic accounts for 0.4 percent of the earth's population and for 1.3 percent of the world's national income. On a per capita basis our national income is more than triple that of the earth's.

The 1983 volume of industrial output of the GDR was higher than the 1949 volume by a factor of 13.3. In some sectors production increased particularly rapidly. Thus, within that period production in the areas of electronics, electrical engineering and instrument making increased by a factor of 45; it exceeded a factor of 20 in machine building and transport machine building and increased by a factor of 15.5 in the chemical industry. These figures revealed a lengthy and complex process in the course of which the dislocation caused by the war was eliminated through the hard and persistent work of the people and an efficient national economy with contemporary ratios and structure was created.

The population's living condition improved steadily thanks to these changes. We must remember that in 1949 the average monthly real per capita income was 133 marks. By 1983 it had reached 878 marks. Within that time per capita retail trade had increased from 731 to 6,245 marks per year. Here is another particularly noteworthy example: the year the republic was founded 29,825 housing units were built at a cost of 300 million marks. A total of 197,200 housing units were built in 1983, while capital investments in housing reached 6.2 billion marks. A total of 3,459,740 apartment units were built in 35 years. Most of them, or 2,108,560 were completed after 1971--the year of the 8th Party Congress. The number of apartments with bathtubs and showers increased significantly. All of this provides an idea of the scale of the housing construction program, which is the core of our social policy. With the implementation of the program by the year 1990 the social problem of housing will have been resolved in our country.



The variety of other familiar steps aimed at the development of families, particularly those with three or more children, and improving the living conditions of newly married couples, are well-known. Let us add to these various steps taken to increase pensions, improve public education and health care and many others--various features which, as a whole, are part of social insurance and create good working and living conditions in our country. They became possible as a result of higher labor productivity and dynamic growth of output, which were particularly characteristic of the period starting with the 1970s. This development took place under the sign of unity of economic and social policy, thanks to which that period was particularly successful in the history of our German Democratic Republic.

Therefore, the policy formulated at the 8th Party Congress of resolving the main problems of building socialism ensured rapid economic progress by becoming a reliable and dynamic motive force of development of all realms of social life. The fact that good work brings results and is an important incentive for achieving the highest possible indicators on the job has been thoroughly understood. The successful progress of the socialist German state and the firm positions it holds in economic competition in the international arena and the contribution which the GDR is making to strengthening the socialist world are increasingly turning into direct incentives for our daily work.

The best confirmation of this fact is the course of preparations for the 35th anniversary of the founding of the GDR. The further acceleration of economic growth was the result of the extensive development of the competition. By the end of July 1984 the produced national income was 5.1 percent higher compared to the same period in 1983. The volume of net industrial output increased by 8.2 percent and labor productivity, based on net output, by 7.4 percent. Many labor collectives worked shock shifts in honor of World Peace Day.

The outlines of the future are becoming apparent in the course of the formulation of the 1985 national economic plan and the creation of a base for the forthcoming 5-year period. Economic efficiency is growing significantly and the sectorial structure of the national economy is increasingly changing. It is resting on the most modern technological processes and will be producing the latest model goods. At the same time, thanks to the steady economic and social policy pursued by the party, the way of life of the people will continue to improve. Stated briefly, it is a question of the successful building of a developed socialist society in accordance with the resolutions of the 10th SED Congress and the party program on the even more efficient utilization and demonstration of the historical advantages of socialism.

Let us consider the implementation of the scientific and technical revolution, which is an important task directed toward the future. We can justifiably be proud of results in the development of microelectronics, robot manufacturing, computers and other latest equipment. However, we also have in mind the strict requirements which this area will be facing in the future.

The use of the advantages of socialism, closely related to the possibilities of the scientific and technical revolution, became with full justification the

main task of our party's economic strategy. The pace of economic growth in the international arena is fast and increasing. Furthermore, we must not underestimate the material possibilities of capitalist countries. It is also obvious, however, that capitalism, which has the most advanced production forces, is unable to resolve the vitally important problems affecting the working people. Under capitalist conditions scientific and technical progress is accompanied by mass unemployment and curtailed social rights. Poverty is increasing in the highly developed capitalist countries against a background of fast profit growth, as confirmed by their own data.

The more rapidly and efficiently we are able to resolve the economic and social problems of the scientific and technical revolution, together with the working people and in their interest, through a socialist system, the more reliably we shall secure and enhance the level reached in the material well-being and cultural life of the working people. It is precisely in this area that we have further proof of the fact that socialism alone can resolve contemporary problems for the good of the people.

#### Together With the Soviet Union and All Fraternal Countries

Fraternal cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, particularly within CEMA, is a vitally important base for the successful development of the GDR. From the moment our people were liberated from fascism, the Soviet Union has helped us in building socialism and providing us with bread and tractors and, above all, with valuable advice, when we were taking our first steps in exercising our political power. As the years passed, this cooperation grew into extensive interaction, the prospects of which were defined for decades ahead, through the third millennium, with the 7 October 1975 Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Aid Treaty. We are steadily giving new life to this treaty. Increased trade between the two countries is proof of the high dynamism and tremendous volume of economic interaction between the GDR and the USSR: it rose from 300 million rubles in 1950 to 14 billion rubles in 1984. The two countries are, reciprocally, their biggest trade partners.

The possibility of and need for international cooperation between fraternal countries objectively increases with the development of socialism within the country. Life has fully confirmed this firm conviction of ours. Furthermore, the more the achievements of the individual socialist countries increase the more they use the opportunities provided by the international community. Aware of this fact, the GDR is actively pursuing a policy of increasingly interweaving our national economy with that of the USSR and intensifying socialist economic integration.

Major projects, such as a common power supply system and our participation in building the main gas pipeline, modern power stations in the GDR or a data processing system--a unified computer system--are the results of the implementation of such a joint course. Today there is no vitally important problem not resolved by the GDR in fraternal cooperation with the Soviet Union. Suffice it to mention the securing of an energy and raw material base for mastery of a promising area of scientific and technical progress such as microelectronics. The network of various ties between combines and scientific

institutions in the GDR and their partners in the fraternal socialist countries is expanding. Economic efficiency, friendship, measures and meetings imbued with the spirit of internationalism, which substantially influence the life of the people, are the results of cooperation in training cadres, research and production.

The long-term trends of our cooperation were concretized at the 1984 CEMA summit economic meeting, which was held in Moscow in June 1984, above all in the course of our talk with K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman. Extensive coordination of economic policy provides important prerequisites for this. In both countries it is aimed at the increasing satisfaction of the needs of the people and the comprehensive strengthening of socialism. Such problems are being resolved along the high road of intensification. Obtaining the highest possible results in science and technology and their use for the good of man jointly with the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist community will be of vital importance to us in the years to come. This will also strengthen the economic positions of socialism in the world arena. Achievements in this field encourage us to undertake the systematic implementation of new large-scale plans and strengthen our confidence in the successful completion of this project.

#### Decisive Joint Actions in the Defense of Peace

We consider that the most important task today is lifting the threat of nuclear catastrophe and ensuring the reliable defense of lasting peace. We must secure for the present and future generations a happy life and the possibility of working in peace, without fear of a new world war. In the 35 years of its existence the GDR has dedicated tireless efforts to the accomplishment of this objective and whenever the international situation became particularly grave it has tried to contribute to the solution of disputes not through the force of arms but through talks. Today as well, when Europe has entered a new and possibly its most dangerous period of postwar development, more than ever before we are fully resolved to do everything possible to preserve peace. This was most emphatically stressed at the 7th (1983) SED Central Committee Plenum.

The U.S. administration is pursuing a course of confrontation, arms race and "crusade" against the socialist countries and is openly preparing for war. With the agreement of some of its NATO allies, the United States is deploying first-strike nuclear weapons in various Western European countries, including the FRG. This is taking place despite the repeatedly expressed desire of the peoples of such countries and regardless of their interest and has created a major aggravation of the international situation. This eliminated the foundation for talks between the USSR and the United States on limiting and reducing medium-range nuclear missiles and strategic weapons.

On the one hand, the ruling U.S. circles make public statements about their desire for peace. On the other, their actions prove an entirely opposite intention. Along with the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles, they are making preparations to position nuclear weapons in outer space. The American supporters of a first strike policy are not only promoting the theory



of the "possibility" of "limited" nuclear warfare in which "victory" would be allegedly possible (but which, in reality, threatens the destruction of everyone, for such a war would have neither winners nor losers); they are also thinking of "star wars." The adventurism of such plans is exceeded only by their hatred of mankind.

The earth must not become a nuclear hell. It is necessary, above all, to preserve the approximate military-strategic balance which the most aggressive NATO circles, the United States above all, are trying to distrust. It was on the basis of this balance, which is one of the most significant historical accomplishments of socialism, that Europe was able to live in peace for the 40 years since World War II. The defense of peace and tireless efforts to preserve it in the interests of the peoples are a vital necessity. Accordingly, subsequent to the deployment of NATO missiles, our country took the necessary countermeasures which include, in accordance with the agreement between the USSR and the GDR, the deployment on our territory of operative-tactical missiles of increased range.

As an outpost of peace in Europe and for the entire 35 years since its founding our republic has been carrying out its duties. It actively works for the implementation of proposals formulated at the Prague Political Declaration of Warsaw Pact Countries and the Moscow Declaration of Leading Party and State Personalities of the Socialist Countries. It is a question of a program of acceptable steps for the sake of ending the arms race, the nuclear above all, returning to detente and constructive political dialogue and creating prerequisites for fruitful talks on limiting armaments and disarmament based on equality and identical security. The GDR looks at the Stockholm Conference as well in the light of these important tasks, as it participates in its work, with a view to achieving maximally positive results.

The deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles by the United States and NATO must be stopped and the already installed systems must be dismantled. This would allow us to revoke our countermeasures. In the view of many Western European political personalities, increased stockpiles of weapons do not improve security. These people realize that converting the European countries into launching pads for U.S. nuclear missiles is exceptionally dangerous and fraught with severe consequences for the cause of peace.

Under those circumstances, proposals of establishing nuclear-free zones in Europe and the Swedish initiative of establishing a corridor along the demarcation line between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, free from theater nuclear weapons, assume increasing importance. The GDR comprehensively supports this initiative and is prepared to allow its entire territory to become such a corridor. Our objective is a Europe free of nuclear weapons.

We ascribe particular importance to the Soviet proposals on preventing the militarization of space. It is noteworthy that, as in the past, the United States is reacting to this negatively, letting it be known that it intends to implement its plan of extending the arms race to outer space.

The Prague proposal formulated at the Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact members of concluding a treaty on the reciprocal

nonuse of military force and maintaining relations of peace between Warsaw Pact and NATO members met with a broad response on the part of the international public. Political leaders who think realistically and listen to the voice of common sense and all peace-loving people consider such a proposal an important contribution to the prevention of nuclear catastrophe and improving the international situation.

More than ever before our duty today is to do everything possible to preserve peace. We are guided by this also in our relations with the FRG. The danger that once again war may break out on German soil has appeared as a result of the deployment of Pershing II missiles on its territory. By agreeing to the placing of such missiles, the FRG government assumed a heavy responsibility, for which reason the main problem governing relations between the GDR and the FRG is that of safeguarding peace. This is also consistent with the treaty on foundations of relations between the GDR and the FRG, according to which the two countries pursue an independent domestic and foreign policy.

The contemporary international situation is difficult and dangerous without, however, being irreversible. Everything depends on the joint efforts and decisive actions of those who sincerely want peace. The Soviet Union and the entire socialist community are the most reliable and influential bulwark in this struggle. The citizens of our country realize that they serve the cause of peace best by comprehensively strengthening the GDR and making their contribution to strengthening the international positions of socialism. It is from this viewpoint that preparations are taking place for the celebration of the 35th anniversary of the founding of our republic and it is this which will continue to determine our efforts. In their struggle for a lasting peace, socialism, progress and a happy future, the peoples can always rely on the first socialist state of workers and peasants on German soil.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## KOMMUNIST ON USSR-GDR ECONOMIC COOPERATION

AU191930 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84)  
pp 68-76

[Article by L. Kostandov: "The USSR and the GDR: 35 Years of Economic Cooperation"--the last article written by Leonid Arkadyevich Kostandov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Soviet Section of the Intergovernmental Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation between the USSR and the GDR, who died 5 September 1984. Also published in the journal EINHEIT, 1984, No 9-10]

[Text] Thirty-five years ago, on 7 October 1949, the German Democratic Republic was proclaimed the first worker-peasant state in German history.

A period which is short from a historical point of view divides us from this date. But even over this short period of time the GDR has become a powerful, dynamically developing socialist country with a highly developed industry, intensive agriculture and high standard of living and a state which is a firm link in our socialist community and which has won prestige in the international arena.

These achievements are the fruit of the efforts of the GDR's people and of the leading role of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED). At the same time they are also the result of political, economic, cultural and other ties with the countries of the socialist community and of extensive and varied cooperation with the Soviet Union. The GDR attaches great significance to cooperation with the USSR. The SED program notes: "Inviolable friendship and cooperation with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and with the Soviet people have been, are and will continue to be a source of strength and vital development for the socialist GDR."

Cooperation between the USSR and the GDR is successfully implemented in many directions. The top-level economic conference of the CEMA countries held in Moscow this June created new, broad prerequisites and gave a new impulse to its further development at an increasingly rapid rate and on an increasing scale. There is no doubt that analysis of the accumulated experience of cooperation between our countries is useful to make the fullest possible use of these prerequisites. In this connection, we will dwell on some of the main stages of this cooperation while naturally primarily focusing on today.



Immediately following the formation of the GDR, work began on preparing the economic, organizational and juridical basis for economic relations between our countries. In 1950, the first agreement was signed on trade turnover and payments, which envisaged the USSR providing the GDR with machines and equipment, foodstuffs and also many types of raw and other materials.

During that period serious disproportions arose in the industry of the young state, since it had only a 5 percent share of the total amount of iron ore extracted in the whole of Germany, 2 percent of the total amount of coal mined and 7 percent of the total production of ferrous metals, while it had a one-third share of all machine construction and 24 percent of the total output of the chemical industry of prewar Germany.

Only the Soviet Union could liquidate or at least soften these disproportions and help put the majority of industrial enterprises into operation by supplying them with the raw materials they lacked and placing the necessary orders. And it did a great deal in this regard.

In 1950, trade between the USSR and GDR approximated 300 million rubles while it exceeds 14 billion rubles in 1984. This is the greatest trade volume that the Soviet Union and GDR have ever had with other countries of the world.

Growth in trade turnover is an important indicator of the development in economic relations. But life has demanded new forms of cooperation and a deepening and expanding of the spheres of its application to resolve an increasing range of problems not only regarding exchange, but also production and scientific-technical progress.

In this connection the Intergovernmental Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation between the USSR and GDR was formed in 1966. From the very outset its work has been oriented toward organizing cooperation between the ministries of both countries for the purpose of resolving concrete economic problems.

There are now virtually no branch ministries in the USSR or GDR which would not cooperate in one form or another with their partner and would not fulfill the tasks of expanding production, increasing its efficiency and making the transition to the manufacture of new commodities on this basis. This type of work is conducted in approximately 200 ways.

Setting the USSR's national economy on a path of intensive development is the pivot of the CPSU's contemporary economic strategy. In his speech at a meeting with voters on 2 March 1984 Comrade K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasized: "Constant, dynamic growth of the economy and especially its efficiency are necessary to successfully implement our social programs."

Intensifying production and implementing it on the basis of the maximum economy of labor expenditure and reduction in the specific expenditure of raw and other materials and energy have been put forward as the SED's prime task. These strategic party directives determine the main substance of the

activities of the Intergovernmental Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation Between the USSR and GDR.

The basis of production intensification is the introduction of new, progressive technological processes and the utilization of the latest scientific and technological achievements. Proceeding from this, the Intergovernmental Commission organizes the joint implementation of a whole series of measures, from the creation of conditions for the concrete utilization of the most economical contemporary technological processes to reciprocal deliveries of products.

The first stage of this cooperation is joint scientific research and experimental design work and then division of the list of manufactured goods produced with the use of the results of this work in order to ensure the concentration of production of these groups of products at respective enterprises in the USSR and GDR that have their own technology for these products. It is precisely this that makes the use of highly efficient technology possible.

This form of cooperation is based on the well-known law in accordance with which new technological processes yield economic effect mainly when production using these processes reaches an optimum and the manufacture of technologically homogeneous commodities reaches sufficiently high standards of production in series.

This principle was put into practice for the first time on a large scale in 1972 with cooperation in the production of industrial equipment and the reconstruction of the Magdeburg Equipment Plant and the Penza Heavy Industrial Equipment Plant. The enterprises redistributed the selection of equipment they manufactured so that the production of some pieces of equipment would be concentrated at the Soviet enterprise and of others at the GDR enterprise. This made it possible to introduce new technological processes requiring production in relatively high series.

As a result, the Penza plant produced two lines manufacturing certain types of equipment to satisfy the needs of both the USSR and GDR. Magdeburg has succeeded in organizing new economical processes, in particular plasma founding.

The study and generalization of experience of this type of cooperation has also led to concluding agreements on cooperation in the production of chemical equipment, printing press machine construction, the optical-engineering industry, the production of needle-sinker equipment for textile, knitting and sewing enterprises and the production of a whole series of other machine construction products. The increase in production efficiency at the corresponding Soviet and German enterprises has been between 12 and 20 percent.

The Intergovernmental Commission has recently also increasingly extensively utilized another form of intensification of identical production operations.

After selecting enterprises in the USSR and GDR that manufacture products related in terms of technology used and which, as a whole, show an insufficiently high level of production efficiency, all the main technological processes were conditionally broken down into equal operations. Each of these operations at a Soviet enterprise, for example, is compared with an analogous operation in the GDR according to the main technical and economic parameters. These parameters are primarily the level of efficiency and the specific expenditure of labor, raw materials and energy. This type of comparison clearly reveals the most effective technical decisions in a given sector of the technological process.

At the second stage the best solutions that have been found in this way are introduced wherever certain concrete problems are not being resolved in the best possible way. At every enterprise there is something new, progressive and economical and, as a result of cooperation, comprehensive technological processes in similar production units in both countries are enriched with the best and most effective solutions.

The scale on which this form of cooperation is used is constantly growing. In particular, work is being carried out to intensify hosiery production at the Riga Avrora Factory and the Brest Hosiery Combine and at the Theuringen Factory and the Esda Hosiery Factory in the GDR. As preliminary calculations show, labor productivity at Avrora has increased by no less than 10 percent, while the specific expenditure of raw materials has decreased and the quality of products improved.

The USSR and GDR organizations pay special attention to reducing the specific expenditure of raw and other materials in the process of intensifying the production of consumer goods. Economizing on these materials makes it possible to increase the volume of production. Because the proportion of raw and other materials in light industry rarely falls below 60 percent of the prime cost of a finished product, economizing raw materials, for example, by 5 percent, increases the possibility of producing finished commodities from the same quantity of raw materials by more than 8 percent.

A comparison of specific expenditures of materials in the USSR and GDR is being made not only in light industry, but also in other branches to bring such possibilities to light.

It has been established, for example, that the total amount of plasticized rubber used for the manufacture of insulation of electric cables in the GDR is less than at many Soviet plants. The reason is that inexpensive fillers are used, particularly ordinary chalk, the cost of which is a great deal less than that of plastic. In this connection, the joint development of technology and equipment for the production of heavily loaded and reinforced polymers materials has been organized.

The pooling of efforts to intensify identical production operations is also implemented by a number of chemical enterprises, particularly those producing ammonia and carbamide.



Over a comparatively short period of time and with a minimum of expenditure, efficiency in a number of production sectors in both countries has increased 15-20 percent.

In recent years, which have been marked by furious scientific and technological development and expanded cooperation between the states of the socialist community, a new trend in mutual economic relations between our countries is becoming increasingly evident. Having begun on a relatively small scale, for example, in the form of joint work by specialists to develop a certain scientific-technical design or technological idea, cooperation has led to results that are used to great effect not only in the fulfillment of tasks which, when originally set, were comparatively limited, but also in resolving problems in other branches of the national economy; although, not even the most farsighted specialists could have foreseen this possibility at the initial stages of cooperation.

This trend is very promising and the possibilities of putting it to effective use must be considered everywhere. We will cite some examples.

As early as 1969, having pooled theoretical analyses in the sphere of high-pressure polyethylene production and also the applied knowledge of the USSR and GDR organizations, the Intergovernmental Commission organized the work of the ministries of the chemical industry in both countries, as well as that of machine builders, in building a highly efficient plant for the production of an important synthetic construction material--high-pressure polyethylene.

As a result of the joint work, the first plant with a capacity of 50,000 tons of high quality polyethylene, known as polymer, was fully commissioned in Novopolotsk in 1975. From the very first months it guaranteed high efficiency and good quality products and has proved to be relatively economical and simple to service. In particular, labor productivity there is 17 percent higher than at plants imported from capitalist countries. It is indicative that a license for the right to build similar plants has been acquired by the large West German concern Bergbau and Huettenbetriebe A. G. Salzgitte, from which the Soviet Union used to purchase equipment in large quantities for the production of polyethylene.

Through the efforts of specialists from the USSR and GDR, polyethylene production continues to be perfected. In 1979, a high pressure plant with a 60,000 ton capacity was put into operation in the GDR and successfully operates now. The construction of several new, more perfect plants has begun in the USSR. Plants are now being built with a 75,000-ton capacity and obviously, in the near future, the 100,000-ton line will be crossed.

The variety of manufactured goods that will now be produced not only from polyethylene, but also from products of the copolymerization of ethylene and vinyl acetate is also expanding. There are plans to create materials which, in many indexes, will fundamentally improve the products of the polymer plants and expand the variety of manufactured goods.

But even this is not the limit. An agreement has been signed that envisages intensifying plants already operating in the USSR and GDR and introducing

improvements to those in the process of being built. In addition, there are plans to elaborate technological processes in the manufacture of new types of polyethylene that have greater strength and to create compound materials on their basis. It is also planned to broaden the spheres of application of these materials as valuable substitutes of ferrous and nonferrous metals in automobile construction, machine tool building, aircraft building and other branches.

Thus, the cooperation that began 15 years ago on a relatively humble scale has become large-scale and, the main thing, multilateral, the development of which will undoubtedly continue.

This useful experience also finds application in other production operations.

In particular, Soviet and German specialists have begun cooperating in converting freight road transport from petrol to natural gas and also in converting diesel engines--not only in automobiles, but also in diesel locomotives and river-going vessels--to natural gas. This problem is being resolved by machine builders and other organizations in both countries.

Joining forces in the process of branching out of a once selected direction is closely bound up with the practice applied by the Intergovernmental Commission of consistently conducting all stages of cooperation--from scientific and design work to the organization of the industrial production of a concrete commodity--on a scale necessary to both countries.

The creation of the weaving machine TMM-360, which works on a completely new principle and ensures that labor productivity increase 2-3 times while the specific expenditure of metal used in its manufacture is less and the production areas smaller, can be cited as an example. The working conditions for weavers are greatly improved in this respect.

Models are built and tested. Now the task is to organize the multiple production of machines on the basis of cooperation, having reconstructed enterprises in both the USSR and GDR for this purpose. This is a very broad sphere of cooperation. It is sufficient to say that approximately 9,000 attachments and special instruments must be designed, manufactured and tested and completed on the basis of the results of these tests for the multiple production of the TMM-360. Naturally, this work will yield results more quickly if it is based on cooperation and this cooperation itself will be conducted at the highest level of organization based on a well-considered, smoothly operating system of mutual relations between the enterprises, production associations, combines and ministries of both countries. The USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances and the USSR Ministry of Light Industry and a number of combines are now successfully conducting this work.

Comprehensive cooperation between our countries is an effective means of improving product quality. In particular, one direction in which efforts are joined is concentrated on improving passenger railcars, which GDR enterprises have manufactured for the USSR for more than 30 years. These deliveries are of great economic importance for the GDR's national economy--large and long-

term Soviet orders make it possible to produce cars with specialized capacities at relatively low costs. There are practically no other producers in the world which would have such large orders for passenger cars.

It is a well-known fact that the more specialized production becomes, the more complicated it is to make the transition to a new design. Being well aware of this and proceeding from the principles of the international socialist division of labor, the Soviet side assists in switching the GDR enterprises over to the production of a new type of railcar that meets not only today's heightened requirements, but also those of the coming decade. The USSR will supply certain component parts for the cars and also equipment and materials by way of cooperation.

Making use of the potentials not only of the manufacturer, but also of the consumer, to resolve a given problem is particularly effective in organizing the production of goods and materials that require new, rapidly changing and complex technology. Organizing the mass production of electronic elements can serve as an example.

As early as 1977, the electronic industries of the USSR and GDR were set the task of ensuring the transition in both countries to an identical element base.

This required cooperation in a whole series of directions--in the production of highly pure substances necessary for the manufacture of electronics and microelectronics products, in the production of specialized equipment for their manufacture and in the designing and manufacture of the elements themselves. This had to be organized in such a way that the transition to fundamentally new designs of electronic elements and new technological processes could be implemented approximately every 3-4 years.

The joining of forces in the electronics sphere does not only have great significance from the point of view of utilizing the potentials of scientific-technical progress in this branch alone, but also accelerates the progress of a whole series of scientific, technological and productive spheres. Cooperation in this sphere now helps to resolve major problems in both the USSR and GDR and not only in the electronics industry, but also in other branches.

Having expanded its potential on the basis of cooperation, the electronics industry in the USSR and GDR supplies other spheres of the national economy with electronic elements of the most diverse types and purposes. Within the framework of the activities of the Intergovernmental Commission alone, a fundamentally new telecommunications apparatus, in particular the so-called quasi-electronic type, which is controlled by the jointly built Neva electronic machine, has been developed and introduced into production. Electronics' great contribution was evident when developing and manufacturing the MKF-6 camera for taking photographs from outer space and when jointly building many scientific and technical instruments and control mechanisms.

One of the main results of this is the fact, as was noted at the 10th SED Congress, that not only the USSR, but also the GDR, now belongs to that small



number of countries whose industry can design and produce microelectronic elements and the materials necessary for their manufacture, as well as high-quality equipment for their production on the basis of the most progressive technology. Thus, in 1976, the republic produced a small number of microelectronic elements worth only a few million marks. In 1980, their production had already come close to one billion marks; by 1985, the production of these articles will have grown approximately three times in comparison to 1980. Also, whereas eight basic technological processes for the production of electronic elements have been developed and introduced in the last few years, their number will total 15 to 17 in the immediate future. These achievements, which are important for the GDR, are closely connected with cooperation with the USSR. The Soviet national economy has also achieved good results in this sphere.

The dynamic development of this branch, the vast importance of scientific analyses, many times greater than in the other branches and the necessity for a rapid turnover of technology and, consequently, of equipment have required relatively great independence in the relations between the organizations of both countries, including in the sphere of exchange.

In order to service these rapidly developing channels of cooperation, the Intergovernmental Commission had developed and the industrial ministries together with the ministries of foreign trade in both countries have adopted a form of cooperation that considerably resolves the problems of exchanging component parts and block units while conducting scientific research work and perfecting designs.

This form--the so-called global contract--grants the organizations in charge of a given branch the right to resolve the problems of deliveries throughout the year and the purchase, within certain sums, of small batches of samples of component parts, materials, the results of scientific and technical activities, and so forth, without having to wait for an agreement on prices and on other contractual conditions.

It is envisaged that this agreement will be reached by the foreign trade organizations later, when the manufactured article has been delivered or the production service rendered, usually at the end of the year. This practice with the ministries in charge of the electronics industry is also successfully applied within the framework of the activities of bilateral international organizations in the sphere of the photochemical industry (Assofoto) and in the production of domestic chemical products (Domokhim). This mechanism has not yet completely eliminated difficulties in the exchange of manufactured articles necessary, for example, for building an experimental or pilot plant or for building an experimental model of a complex product manufactured in a small number of copies, but it can already give vital help in resolving these frequently encountered problems.

The Intergovernmental Commission organizes cooperation on an increasingly large scale in the reconstruction and modernization of enterprises for the purpose of introducing new types of highly productive technology and equipment. Thus, furniture factories in Ulyanovsk and in Aulenburg have been reconstructed. Labor productivity has considerably increased as a result and

the quality of products, especially at Ulyanovsk, has sharply improved. Reconstruction of the Sachsenwerk Heavy Electrical Machine Plant at Dresden is in the finishing stages.

Reconstruction has also begun at 19 Soviet factories that produce consumer goods. Here the matter is not limited to supplying machines and equipment and transferring contemporary technology. An increasingly important place is occupied by joint development of projects applying to equipment possessed by both countries. The creation of new designs and technology and the resolution of other problems upon which increasing the volumes and improving the quality of products depends and, particularly, cooperation in retraining workers and production organizers.

Experience shows that cooperation does not end with putting the last machine into operation or commissioning the last technological process. Cooperation between Soviet and German enterprises continues even further. It finds reflection, for example, in the fact that our enterprises receive new clothing and footwear models from their friends in the GDR, as well as dressmaking patterns and data on new technological processes.

Cooperation between the USSR and GDR, as between other CEMA countries, has become an important means of improving production efficiency and their Peoples' well-being. It increases labor productivity, improves the quality of manufactured commodities, increases the possibilities of satisfying demands for goods for production and personal consumption and ensures a variety of production that comes as close as possible to the characteristics necessary to the consumers.

At the same time, as participants in the top-level economic conference of the CEMA member countries noted, there are still considerable reserves for expanding mutual cooperation, intensifying the specialization and cooperation of production and increasing reciprocal trade in the interests of making more effective use of the production and scientific-technical potential of the fraternal countries.

Such reserves also exist in the mutual relations between the USSR and GDR. Certain difficulties and shortcomings in the organization of cooperation must be eliminated for these reserves to be put to maximum use.

Science and technology not only affect the national economy directly, that is, through the introduction of new discoveries, progressive designs and technology and new managerial methods, the results of which are sufficiently obvious and relatively easily lend themselves to organization and control, but also indirectly, particularly through technical norms, regulations and standards.

In this respect, in connection with the long process involved in drawing up these norms, regulations and standards and establishing them in the practice of cooperation between countries, it is frequently the case that it would be possible to utilize new scientific and technical developments in the designing, forming and building of technological processes, developments that would make it possible to sharply improve design, perfect technology and alter

construction and other parameters, but it is impossible to introduce them--this would run counter to operative norms and regulations. It is precisely for this reason that specific capital investments, the expenditure of construction materials, the weight of technological equipment and the norms of expenditure of fuel and initial raw materials are frequently overestimated and on a "legal" basis.

How can these undesirable phenomena be eliminated? Practice shows that cooperation between countries in comparing norms and regulations and in revealing those sectors where they are unwarrantably underestimated or overestimated can be an important factor in the introduction of scientific-technical achievements.

It was shown above that if the technological processes of manufacturing one and the same product in the GDR and the USSR are broken down into elements, compared, and the parameters of production improved on this basis, extensive possibilities for increasing production efficiency come to light. The national economy can also glean benefit, similar in nature but many times greater in terms of size, from comparing the norms, regulations and standards operative in the USSR, the GDR and other countries and from selecting, as a result of this comparison, highly effective technical solutions and more rigid norms and regulations. This aspect awaits its practicable introduction.

The top-level economic conference of CEMA member countries noted that extensively developing production cooperation and establishing direct links between associations, enterprises and organizations is an important aspect of perfecting the economic mechanism of cooperation and increasing its efficiency. Direct links are called upon to ensure coordination in matters regarding the utilization of scientific and technical achievements adopted from one another and the resolution of great and small production problems in the course of preplan preparation. These links must be implemented not only between ministries, enterprises and their associations in one production branch--they are fairly extensively developed in this sphere--but also between branch ministries and associations in charge of various branches and sub-branches of the national economy in the USSR and GDR. In connection with the increased significance of the complexity factor in the resolution of economic problems it is necessary, in our opinion, to gradually make the transition to a system of organizing cooperation under which any link in the production chain--directly or via a minimum of interim instances--could reveal the potentials of a partner, including from adjoining branches, and cooperate on this basis in resolving problems of not only an internal branch, but also of an interbranch nature.

The definite positive results in improving production efficiency, which have been achieved by means of concentrating production, have already been noted. In our opinion, the task of both sections of the Intergovernmental Commission is to increase the scale of work to utilize the concentration of production of concrete items in the USSR or GDR to reach optimum standards of production in series and on this basis to ensure the maximum feedback from new economic technological processes.



Without dwelling on other, as yet not fully utilized, possibilities for expanding production cooperation between the USSR and the GDR, we will note that this cooperation is being slowed down because of insufficient activeness on the part of the branch ministries and their associations, combines and enterprises in both the USSR and GDR.

Obviously, it is not only a matter of understanding the usefulness of cooperation, but also of the necessity to improve the centralized control of this cooperation and to increase the responsibility of the ministries, enterprises and their associations for failing to utilize potentials for cooperation. In our opinion, the Intergovernmental Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation between the USSR and the GDR must be granted greater rights in resolving these problems.

Participants in the top-level economic conference of CEMA member countries noted that during the past 1.5 decades, thanks to the selfless work of the peoples under the leadership of the communist and workers parties, the countries of the socialist community have fundamentally strengthened their economic and scientific-technical potential, implemented major social programs and ensured the stable growth of the people's well-being and further development in science, education, culture, public health care and social insurance. The increased economic might of the CEMA member countries is a material basis for their policy of peace, international detente and mutually advantageous cooperation.

The USSR and GDR, the CPSU and SED and their multifaced cooperation have made an appreciable contribution to these impressive successes of the socialist community. The peoples of the Soviet Union and the GDR, said Comrade Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee, at the 10th SED Congress, are truly allies, comrades and friends. For the sake of this, our parties have done a vast amount of political work. This fraternal alliance is a great revolutionary achievement which will remain inviolable for all time.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/2

## STRUCTURAL CRISIS AND SOCIOPOLITICAL POLARIZATION IN THE CAPITALIST WORLD

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 77-89

[Article by V. Kuvaldin, head of sector at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the International Workers Movement]

[Text] After a period of relative stability during the 1950s and 1960s, capitalism entered a new phase of aggravation of internal contradictions. With the start of the 1970s, the mechanism of capitalist accumulation, based on the utilization of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, the extensive use of the Keynesian method of state-monopoly economic control and nonequivalent trade with developing countries, is increasingly beginning to break down. The report of the Trilateral Commission--one of the influential "brain trusts" in the capitalist world--which appeared in April in 1984 notes that starting in the 1970s the "global economy has been unable to come out of one crisis before becoming afflicted with the next."

The pace of economic development dropped in the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s; inflation and unemployment increased and the income of the working people declined. The average annual growth rates of the GNP of the 24 member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) dropped from 4.8 percent in 1967-1973 to 2.7 percent in 1973-1979. In the 1980s the capitalist economy has been stagnating and its volume of output has been increasing by 1-2 percent annually.

During the 1970s the average annual growth of consumer prices in OECD countries was 9 percent; it was almost 8 percent in the 1980s. Price levels in the United States, Japan and Canada tripled and in the European Economic Community (EEC) they increased by a factor of more than 3.5 between 1967 and 1983. Between 1980 and 1983 the number of unemployed in the developed capitalist countries increased by one-half--from 19.2 million to 29.6 million. This does not include the millions of people who, despairing, are no longer looking for work and registering with labor markets, or young people who face the problem of unemployment for the first time. In a number of countries wages have declined. In 1983 real wages dropped to the 1979 level in the FRG, the 1976 level in Great Britain and the 1971 level in the United States.

The slight energizing of the capitalist economy, which was noted last year essentially in Japan and the United States, does not change the overall picture. The manifestation of this a business activity is combined with stable crisis trends; a cyclical upsurge becomes interwoven with a decline in a number of sectors; the asynchronic development of the basic centers of capitalist economy is aggravating the imperialist rivalry among the United States, Western Europe and Japan. An unbalanced development intensifies the stress in the various areas of the national economy. The technical retooling of the economy--the need for which has become obvious--requires massive funding which is difficult to acquire with low growth rates.

The increased contradictions in capitalist reproduction are manifested in the area of money circulation as well. The habit of "live by borrowing" in the hope of future income, which became firmly established under favorable economic conditions, left a heavy legacy of astronomical indebtedness, which is affecting all aspects of economic activities from the behavior of consumers to global economic relations. The drastic worsening of reproduction conditions intensified even further the various types of indebtedness and led to the questioning of the entire system of indebtedness obligations and created the threat of a financial collapse. Therefore, during a period of stagnation the area of monetary circulation became one of the bottlenecks of the capitalist economy.

The system of state-monopoly control, which took decades to develop, not only proved unable to cope with crisis processes but itself became an additional source of economic difficulties. The efforts to resolve this situation were greatly complicated by a number of global problems--raw material, energy, ecological, etc.--which urgently demanded a resolution. The totality of these processes, on which the crisis of the postwar "model" of expanded capitalist reproduction rests, is what defines the contemporary state of the economy of the nonsocialist world today.

Naturally, capitalism is mobilizing all its reserves to come out of its stagnation. The tremendous natural resources and extensive economic potential created through the efforts of many generations, the existence of a solid scientific and technical base, highly skilled manpower and extensive economic management experience enable it to adapt to the new situation and to renovate the technical foundations of its economy. In addressing the session of the CPSU Central Committee commission in charge of drafting the new edition of the CPSU Program, Comrade K. U. Chernenko noted that "...while underscoring the historical doom of contemporary capitalism, we must take into consideration that even under the conditions of its general crisis it still has substantial and far from exhausted reserves."

The conversion to a new model of economic growth, which requires huge capital investments, "social peace" and political stability, raised most urgently the question of priorities and of choosing a political course. The economic upheaval of the last decade undermined the objective foundations of the strategy of social maneuvering, pursued by the ruling classes in the postwar period. It essentially consisted of efforts to compromise with the toiling masses on the basis of a rigidly controlled growth of personal income and consumption, expanding the system of social security and social services and



extensive interference of the state in the economy with a view to maintaining solvent demand. At the beginning of the 1980s this policy had outlived its usefulness. The adverse economic situation and the declining growth rates do not allow simultaneous updating of the economy, increasing the population's purchasing power and developing the social infrastructure.

In an effort to protect its interest, big capital is systematically pursuing an economic strategy aimed at increasing its profits. The process of concentration and centralization of capital is continuing; economic units are being enlarged and "unviolable" enterprises are being closed down. Capitalist activities are increasingly assuming an international nature and the international financial-industrial groups and the multinational corporations (TNK), which accounted for approximately 40 percent of all industrial output, 60 percent of foreign trade and about 80 percent of the technology being developed in the capitalist world at the beginning of the 1980s have become its main subject.

In their pursuit of profits, the monopolies are updating the technical base of output, above all through the extensive utilization of microelectronics, robots and biotechnologies. A structural reorganization of industry is taking place and the organic structure of capital is increasing; capitalist labor efficiency is being promoted on a broad scale. In looking for new resources, capitalism is rushing into outer space and developing the world's oceans.

Along with the various forms of capitalist integration, TNK activities strengthen the internationalization of capital and open for it new areas of application and upgraded maneuverability. Easily crossing national borders, capital undermines the economic autonomy of entire countries. Capital exports play an exceptionally important role in enslaving the developing countries and establishing relations of colonial dependence on a new level.

The internationalization of economic life, in the course of which comprehensive ties and comprehensive interdependence among nations take place" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 4, p 428) leads to the establishment of new huge economic complexes within which production socialization expands. The result is the standardization of production processes, a rapprochement among levels of development and living conditions in capitalist countries and increase the labor productivity and economic efficiency. However, the transition of international integration to a new level is paid with the suffering of millions of working people who are forced to bear the cost of capitalist production rationalization.

The economic, scientific and technical and political interdependence among capitalist countries, particularly in areas such as Western Europe, North America and the Pacific Basin, is increasing under the influence of integration processes. The leading imperialist countries make use of the objective process of internationalization of economic life in ensuring the economic and political subordination of their weaker partners.

In strengthening their rear lines they try to squeeze each other out in the struggle for leadership in the capitalist world. That is always the case in periods of structural reorganization, Lenin's law of uneven development of

capitalism, which could bring about a change in the ratio of forces among imperialist centers, becomes a particularly effective.

The development of the TNK and the increased production, financial and foreign trade interdependence among capitalist countries and their affiliation with closed economic groups are influencing ever more tangibly not only the economic but the sociopolitical life of individual nations. As a result, capitalism acquires greater possibilities of applying economic pressure levels with a view to preventing an undesirable development of events.

The monopolies try to use their increased power for mounting an extensive offensive on the socioeconomic gains of the working people, subordinating the state apparatus to themselves and emasculating bourgeois democratic institutions. Under the pretext of "improving the economy" they reorganize the entire economic mechanism. The economic modernization made by capitalism has a clear sociopolitical orientation: its purpose is to weaken the organized labor movement, its combat-capable detachments in particular.

Profiting from the difficult labor market situation, capitalism is trying to divide the working people and pit some of their factions against others. The most vulnerable population strata have become its first victims: women, young people, members of ethnic minorities, unskilled workers, the elderly, the sick and the disabled. In mid-1984, 37.7 percent of the unemployed in EEC countries were under 25 and 41.9 percent were women. The situation of immigrant workers, who account for a considerable percentage of hired labor in Western European countries, is extremely unstable.

Added to these categories are other marginal population strata, above all those involved in the so-called "underground economy," such as temporary workers who, in violation of the law and without the benefit of the trade unions, are employed under arbitrary conditions dictated by the entrepreneurs. The "technological revolution" of the 1980s has rapidly increased the stratum of "marginals,"<sup>1</sup> cast on the margin of life, converting them into a special social group with its specific interests. This group includes members of different population strata, such as unemployed and immigrants, the elderly, the uneducated youth, single people and families with many children. Characteristic of the social aspect of the "marginals" are a low standard of education, exceptionally uncertain situation, poor housing conditions, undernourishment and a great dependence on the social security system and various forms of aid. The size of the "marginals" is quite substantial and rising quickly. In 1984 the number of the poor had reached 30 million in the EEC countries and 35 million in the United States.

The marginalizing of a significant percentage of the population is creating serious problems for the organized labor movement. The appearance of a huge reserve labor army makes the situation of hired labor unstable, undermining its positions in relations with entrepreneurs and enables capitalism to increase its offensive on the living standards and social gains of the working people.

The marginals are also a major threat to the bourgeois democratic institutions. The narrowing of the social base of the existing system

undermines its stability and the tremendous number of people who find themselves at the social "bottom" is a nutritive environment for extremist movements and all sorts of adventures.

The technical updating of the production process changes the professional and skill structure of the working class and intensifies differences among its detachments. The increased complexity of the working class and its internal differentiation create an objective foundation for discrimination against categories of working people who have a greater difficulty in protecting themselves from entrepreneurial arbitrariness. As a rule, it is precisely such population strata which join the ranks of the "marginals." It is they who take unskilled and low-paid jobs. Thus, at the start of the 1980s, women's wages were 30-45 percent lower than men's in the developed capitalist countries. The entrepreneurs make use of intraclass differences to undermine proletarian unity and pit some worker detachments against others.

The structural reorganization of the economy and the moving of many enterprises to developing countries, which have extensive reserves of inexpensive manpower, struck painfully at the nucleus of the working class, the factory-plant proletariat. The workers in the old sectors in crisis (coal mining, metallurgy, automobile manufacturing, shipbuilding, some machine building sectors, railroad transportation, etc.)--the traditional supporters of trade unions and proletarian parties--are the most frequently hit.

Compared to the "marginals" and the unskilled detachments of the proletariat employed in crisis sectors, the situation of the skilled workers possessing modern skills, individual white-collar categories, low- and middle-level administrators, engineering and technical personnel and workers in the defense industry and other "flourishing" sectors and in the nationalized sector of the economy may appear good. Under poor economic conditions and the threat of losing their jobs, many of them become particularly concerned with preserving what they have. This intensifies corporate and conservative trends.

The increased socioeconomic heterogeneity of the working population increases the opportunities of the ruling class. At the same time, as Marx himself pointed out, crisis processes may increase the noncoincidence among group interests and rivalry among different detachments of working people. The ruling class makes use of such contradictions to strengthen its power. Imperialism, Lenin wrote, "has a tendency to single out among the workers as well privileged segments and separate them from the broad proletarian mass," "deliberately stratifying the workers" so that a stratified separate segment of the working class may "ally itself with the bourgeoisie" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 27, p 404; vol 35, p 276).

The onslaught of the entrepreneurs on the rights of the working people is accompanied by sermons about the "common" interests shared by labor and capital and the need for "sacrifices for the sake of the common good." In resorting to ideological and psychological influence--ranging from the threat of economic collapse to promises that "prosperity is around the corner"--the bosses try to increase their profits at the expense of labor.



The new phase in the socioeconomic development of capitalism is having a conflicting influence on mass consciousness. A sharp turn in social life and the attempts of the ruling class to mount an offensive caught many people unawares and triggered confusion, a feeling of loss of perspective, apathy and fear of the future. Such processes assume their most acute and destructive form among young people. They promote, on the one hand, social and political passiveness and, on the other, tempestuous forms of protest, which frequently turn to anarchic extremism and antisocial behavior.

Fear of the future triggers among a significant share of the population a kind of defensive reflex and an orientation toward the status quo: "It is better to keep everything as it is so that things may not become any worse." Also influential is the inertia caused by a lengthy and relatively favorable period, when the readiness of the ruling class to compromise and to sacrifice some of its profits for the sake of "social peace" contributed to the dissemination of reformist illusions among the masses.

The ruling class is diligently cultivating conservative trends in the mass consciousness. The bourgeois information media have mounted a broad campaign aimed at the "depolitization" of the masses, the purpose of which is to switch the interests of the working people from the area of "big politics" to that of private interests, daily concerns and narrow group and corporate problems. Particularly active in this respect are the neoconservatives, who criticize the "omnipresent" state and the costly social programs and put the blame for the crisis on the "immoderate" demands of trade unions and emphasize "privatized" interests, the values of private life and family, etc. In appealing to private ownership instincts, they try to revive the traditional bourgeois values by praising the ideals of "economy" and "thrift" and by glorifying petty ownership. The open supporters of social inequality and the hierarchical model of social organization are becoming increasingly active.

Bourgeois nationalism is a dangerous weapon in the hands of the ruling class. Chauvinistic prejudices are revived and encouraged under the circumstances of a fierce competitive struggle for jobs. By using them the reaction promotes quarrels among working people of different nationalities. At the same time, it tries to present as one of the reasons for internal difficulties the legitimate desire of the developing countries to assume a suitable place in the world's economy and politics.

Although the main bearers of conservative trends in the mass consciousness are the middle classes and the social groups gravitating toward them, this trend is making its way among the workers as well, particularly those who, having reached a certain level of prosperity, panic at the fear of losing it.

The worsening material situation and increased insecurity of living conditions also trigger a growth of conservative feelings and increased social protest. As the masses accept the new situation, a process of social polarization takes place: whereas in some strata the crisis and the onslaught of capitalism have caused fear of possible change and the desire to preserve the existing order, in others, conversely, they have stimulated the growth of national exigency and intensified the aspiration for democratic change. The reasons for such different reactions to the consequences of the crisis are rooted in the

different experiences of the mass detachments of working people, in their psychological and intellectual features and the ideological and political conditions of the labor movement.

The process of increased requirements, which has sharply intensified in recent decades under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution, the worker and democratic movements and the historical achievements of socialism, has had a profound impact on the consciousness of the masses. It is manifested in the aspiration of the working people to strengthen their material situation, make labor more meaningful, upgrade social dignity and develop a more harmonious way of life. New needs, a higher level of education and broadened outlook increase the social demands of the masses and enhance the level of their requirements and expectations. In periods of crisis this trend in the mass consciousness is expressed in a refusal to tolerate worsened living conditions and readiness to fight the arbitrariness of the ruling class.

Naturally, the development of a progressive trend in mass consciousness is a complex and contradictory process. The aspiration for change is combined with the desire to retain the existing system and familiar ways of life. The influence of bourgeois and reformist ideology is not the only one to become apparent in this case. The material gains of the working class extracted in the course of recent decades through stubborn struggle, the rapprochement between the proletariat and the other population strata and higher education and cultural standards increase the expectations of the masses and stimulate the intellectual development and social activeness of the working people, who formulate increased requirements relative to the activities of the various social forces, including left-wing parties and trade unions. The new social aspect of the masses demands of the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat a thorough consideration of the particulars of the situation and the awareness of different strata and the ability to convince them of the economic and political substantiation and realism of the radical solutions of social problems as suggested by the communists.

Between the end of the 1970 and beginning of the 1980s the political consciousness of the masses was in a peculiar waiting state. During the crisis faith in the power institutions--the government, the state apparatus, the bourgeois party, etc.--declined and a feeling of alienation from the political system intensified; faith in the ability of the economy to cope with upheavals and to meet the needs of the working people was shaken. The process of alienation from society affected young people particularly strongly.

The requirements facing the left-wing forces increased as a result of complications in the structure of mass consciousness and the intensification of its internal contradictions. The crisis increased the potential for mass political protest. It broadens the sociopsychological prerequisites of the movement for profound social change, peace, democracy and social progress. However, the implementation of such premises calls for a comprehensive consideration of the contemporary level of development of the masses and their increased needs and demands reflected in their attitude toward politics. The leftist revolutionary forces face difficult problems which cannot always be

resolved on the basis of tactical means, methods and concepts, even those which were developed recently.

The political instability in the capitalist world has increased under the influence of the crisis. For a number of years the domestic political situation in many countries has been characterized by drastic fluctuations in the balance of forces and "pendulum" shifts in the center of gravity of the party-political structure. Frequently, even minor changes in the moods of the voters substantially influence the deployment of forces. The growth of the discontent and the alienation of a significant percentage of the population are weakening existing party-political structures even in areas where they seem to be most stable. Thus, the "Greens" appeared in the political arena of the FRG; the social democrats appeared in Britain and John Anderson, an independent candidate, was active in the 1980 campaign for the U.S. presidential elections.

At the turn of the decade it became clear that the efforts of the ruling circles in the capitalist countries to resolve the crisis through a policy partially coordinated with the organizations of the working class had failed. The broad sociopolitical coalitions which had been established for this purpose in Italy, Spain and Luxembourg broke down. Different social forces had to determine how to restructure the economy.

The formulation of a socioeconomic policy became the center of social life in the capitalist countries. It developed in the course of an acute struggle among the classes and parties defending their own solutions of national problems. Depending on the ratio of class forces "each country particularly emphasized sides, features or groups of features of capitalism and the labor movement" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 38, p 304).

Profiting from the difficult situation on the labor market, capitalism tried to impose its conditions on the sale of manpower. The most conservative forces within the ruling class became energized in their aspiration to shift to the right the axis of political life and mount a frontal attack on the socioeconomic gains of the working people. Speculating on the contradictions among the different population strata and relying on the conservative trends in mass consciousness, the reactionary circles mounted a broad campaign of indoctrination of public opinion with a view to proving that many people were living "beyond their means," and that "excessively high" earnings and benefits were undermining the economy, for which reason the only solution to the crisis was to lower the living standard of a considerable percentage of the population.

In a period of growing economic difficulties, with people fearing the loss of their standard of living, the soil for planting conservative ideas was prepared. In circumstances of confusion and turbulence, society accepted the idea that the conservatives should be given the opportunity to put their prescriptions to a practical test. This was linked to the hope of stabilizing the economy, strengthening the social institutions and restoring traditional bourgeois values.



At the same time, the political cover of the "conservative revolution" was also being prepared. In parties such as the Republican in the United States or the Conservative in England, the reins of power were seized by members of the right wing, who blocked the moderates, those who gravitated toward the political center. After revising the foundations of a two-party policy, they charted a course of "social revenge," and intransigent bourgeois class domination.

In a number of countries, the extreme right, using the discontent of the masses and their disappointment at the reformist policy and state-monopoly control, which had revealed their weakness in the face of the crisis, were able to accede to power. In 1980 the right-wing Republican Ronald Reagan won the U.S. presidential elections. Conservatives, who profited from the discontent shown by the masses with governmental policy, in which social democrats played "first violin," won the parliamentary elections in some central and northern European countries (Great Britain, the FRG, Belgium, Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, etc.).

The advent to power of the conservatives is no ordinary "changing of the guard," which occasionally takes place in bourgeois society. Right-wing authoritative forces, representing the interests of the most aggressive bourgeois circles, emerged on the proscenium of political life. Based on monetarist theories, their economy policy is aimed at controlling inflation by reducing government expenditures, abolishing state regulatory activities and lowering taxation of capital. According to its authors, this should stimulate investments and production increases. The most important elements of this policy are freezing wages, reducing allocations for the development of the social infrastructure (education, health care, etc.), eliminating state employment programs and dismantling the social security system. In an effort to change the distribution of the national income in favor of the ruling class, the conservatives are mounting an offensive along the entire front. By reducing "unproductive" expenditures they stimulate the accumulation of capital. The fire of inflation is put out through mass unemployment. They accelerate the updating of the economy by leaving to the mercy of fate millions of people.

The socioeconomic policy of the conservatives strikes particularly fiercely at the most deprived population strata. At the same time, it is characterized by its openly antilabor trend. Thus, the conservatives rely on increased unemployment and worsened material position of the jobless as a means of "disciplining" the working class. They substantially curtail trade union rights in an effort to suppress the opposition of the working people. In Belgium, for example, the right of mandatory revision of elapsed collective contracts was annulled. The British Parliament passed anti-union laws aimed at weakening the labor movement and preventing large-scale actions by working people. Such laws allow the employers selectively to fire strikers and to sue the trade unions for all resulting losses, should a strike exceed strictly defined limits. Should the trade unions oppose the Draconian measures of the authorities, the full power of the bourgeois state is thrown at them. The merciless routing of the air traffic controllers union in the United States became a symbol of such policy.

In general, the veneration of force is characteristic of the conservatives. While granting the monopolies freedom of action, they intensify police control of society and strengthen the repressive machinery. Thus, the West German government is implementing a number of antidemocratic measures: it restricts the right to demonstrate and strengthens the laws governing foreigners and "profession bans." Great Britain has passed discriminatory laws aimed at "colored" immigrants. By gradually emasculating the bourgeois-democratic institutions, the conservatives try to restrict not only the economic but the political rights of the working people as well.

The practical activities of the conservatives reveal a specific vision of the world and historical philosophy, imbued with scorn for and hostility toward the "bottoms." Characterizing the line of the Tory government, the British Marxists point out that "Thatcherism" is not mere politics. It is a system of views based on the belief that reform and the gains of workers and the democratic movement are wrecking the British economy and British society.

The wave of conservatism has revived the extreme right as well. Racists and the neofascist "National Front" front group are actively propagandizing their "ideas" in Great Britain. According to official data, in 1984 legal neo-Nazi organizations alone in the FRG had 21,800 members.

The young people, who have been unable to find their place in life, who have lost faith in themselves and society and have become stupefied by reactionary propaganda, are the easiest prey of the extreme right. Thus, one-half of the members of the FRG neo-Nazi organizations are young people aged 14-20.

Under the conditions of the aggravated political struggle, the right-wing extremists are acting openly and resorting to violence with increased frequency. In the FRG, more than 1,500 crimes committed by neofascists were officially recorded (922 in 1978); 104 of them involved "use of force" (52 in 1978). Spain was threatened with a right-wing coup d'etat at the start of the 1980s.

Not reluctant to engage in open terrorism, the extreme right-wing forces are also trying to gain a certain respectability and status within the power system. They participate in elections and occasionally succeed. For example, the number of votes cast for the neofascist "Italian Social Movement" party showed a significant increase in the Italian 1983 extraordinary parliamentary elections. The extreme right has consolidated its positions in the international arena as well through the creation of new neofascist organizations, such as "Eurodestra" ("right-wing European forces").

The right-wing offensive is encountering growing opposition on the part of the labor movement and the progressive forces. The wave of strikes in Britain, the FRG and Belgium, the upsurge of mass social protest movements, and the turning to the left of major and influential detachments of the social democratic movement, such as the labor party and the Social Democratic Party of Germany, are eroding the social base of the conservatives and undermining their hastily put together coalitions. As the example of the British miners indicates, under such circumstances the struggle of the working class for its

rights is growing into an open onslaught against the basic lines of conservative policy.

A reformist variant of the solution to the crisis, tested in some southwestern European countries (France, Greece, Spain) appeared as an alternative to the right-wing conservative course at the beginning of the 1980s. Here socialist parties, frequently relying on communist support, acceded to power. The essence of this movement is to seek a solution to the crisis together with the labor movement and the democratic forces.

Guided by the principles of the post-Keynesian concept of a directed economy, the socialist governments are trying to broaden the state economic sector. Thus, a broad nationalization of the banks took place in France, the overwhelming majority of whose government is socialist and which, until recently, included four communist ministers, as a result of which 90 percent of all deposits and 85 percent of the loans passed under governmental control. Subsequent to the nationalization of a number of large enterprises, the share of the state sector in industry rose to 24 percent of the labor force and 32 percent of the output. Rumasa, the largest private concern in Spain, was nationalized.

Unlike the monetarist policy of the conservatives, the socialists tried to revive the economy by increasing solvent population demand. The French government passed a number of measures aimed at upgrading the living standard of the low-income strata and reducing unemployment: minimum wages and social benefits were increased; a program of lowering retirement age and shortening the work week was implemented to keep up employment. The Spanish government introduced a 40-hour work week, banned moonlighting and drafted plans for opening 800,000 new jobs. The Greek government announced that steps were being formulated to improve the situation of the working people, such as the creation of 70,000 new jobs in the state and private economic sectors, the imposition of stricter restrictions on mass layoffs, the introduction of a 5-day work week and improvements in the social security system.

The socialist governments are trying to increase the rights of the working people and to strengthen the positions of the trade unions. In France the administrative councils under nationalized companies were democratized and the 1967 anti-trade union ordinance was revoked. The system of consultations with the trade unions was expanded. In Greece state companies include representatives of the working people in their administrative councils.

In domestic policy, the conservative course of "tightening the screws" is countered by the socialists with a certain democratization of the social order. France has considerably broadened the rights of the local authorities, abolished state security courts and the death penalty, improved the conditions for hiring immigrants and expanded somewhat their civil rights. Greece abolished reactionary laws dating back to the civil war.

The shifting to the left of the axis of political life in a number of southern and southwestern European countries and the reforms made in some of them in the interests of the working people were of major importance not only to those countries alone but to the labor movement and the progressive forces of the



entire capitalist world. This proved that the swelling of the "conservative wave" is far from being the fatal result of the structural crisis and that in principle a bourgeois-democratic way of socioeconomic and political development is possible under adverse economic circumstances. This became possible thanks to the long struggle waged by the worker and democratic movements against the political course of right-wing forces--a struggle in which the communist parties in the respective countries played a most active role.

At the same time, however, the course of events proved that the limited reformist course, not accompanied by a decisive and consistent struggle against national and international monopoly capital, is unable to attain the set objectives. Located in the force field of contemporary capitalism, countries with a relatively low potential are forced to accept the "rules of the game" imposed by the leading imperialist states. Under the pressure of big capital, backed by the multinational financial oligarchy, the socialists are violating the essential stipulations of their program, above all in the field of socioeconomic policy. Their inconsistency is triggering the protest of the working people and weakening the position of left-wing forces.

Such negative processes were most clearly apparent in France where the left-wing victory in the 1981 elections had generated high hopes. The French Communist Party Central Committee declaration issued after the communists left the government in July 1984 pointed out that "having achieved substantial successes after 1981, the government changed its political course. This led to increased unemployment, economic stagnation, reduced purchasing power of the working people and the white-collar workers and the income of agricultural workers...."

The communists are struggling for a democratic solution to the crisis by systematically defending the interests of the working people. The communist parties in a number of countries have drafted programs for anticrisis measures, aimed at protecting the masses from capitalist encroachments. They include the "Economic Bill of Rights" which was passed at the 2nd Extraordinary Conference of the U.S. Communist Party in Milwaukee, in 1982. A program for exceptional action was passed in September 1983 at the Plenum of the Canadian Communist Party Central Committee; new proposals relative to economic policy were formulated at the 27th Danish Communist Party Congress in the spring of 1983, etc.

The fierce opposition of conservative forces to "left-wing experiments" in Western Europe proves the great danger which the consolidation of the forces of international reaction, taking place on a global scale, and its onslaught on the gains of the working people and the position of the progressive forces presents to the worker and democratic movements in the capitalist countries and to the prospect of their struggle for social progress.

The manifestations and consequences of this process in the realm of international relations presents an even greater threat to the basic vital interests of the people's masses. The aggressive militaristic trends in imperialist policy, which intensified during the second half of the 1970s and at the beginning of the new decade, became a dominant feature. This was

another confirmation of Lenin's prediction that "international imperialism will mobilize all of its forces against us..." (op. cit., vol 35, p 86). Those same conservative forces which had mounted their broad attack on the rights of the working people, became the flag bearers of the "crusade" against socialism.

The worsening of international relations at the turn of the 1980s, the dangerous aggravation of the situation in various parts of the globe and the conversion of the leading NATO powers, the United States above all, to a course of confrontation with the socialist commonwealth were caused by a number of reasons. Hiding behind the aggressiveness of contemporary imperialism is the growing economic and political influence of the military-industrial complex and the sinister alliance between the military and the largest monopolies. Affiliated with them are groups in the ruling class which are seeking a solution to the crisis through the militarization of the economy.

The course toward confrontation was dictated also by domestic policy considerations. By increasing international tension the ruling circles in the capitalist countries are curtailing the socioeconomic and political rights of the working people under the pretext of the need for "national unity" in the face of the "threat from the outside."

The abandonment of the policy of detente and reliance on "power methods" also concealed the dissatisfaction of influential forces in the capitalist world with the political result of the past decade. Aspiring toward revenge, they intend to wreck the military-strategic balance which developed in the 1970s by launching a raging arms race.

The imperialist strategists decided to make a "test of strength" in the developing countries, which they chose as grounds for the application of their policy. The choice of such a site was largely affected by economic considerations and the desire to tie such countries more closely to the imperialist chariot. Hoping to turn to their advantage the main trends of social development, the imperialist powers--directly or through their assistants--are increasingly resorting to naked force. The armed conflict in the Malvinas, the predatory attack on Grenada, the invasion of Lebanon, the military aid given reactionary regimes in Latin America and efforts to perpetuate the occupation of Namibia are all proofs of the growing aggressiveness of contemporary imperialism. Conservative governments are particularly active in formulating and pursuing this course.

The turn from a policy of detente to cold war required substantive ideological-psychological preparation. Relying on some trends in mass consciousness and speculating on the base feelings of people, for a number of years militaristic propaganda has done everything possible to instill in them fear of the revolutionary processes which are intensifying in the world and of the increased role and influence of world socialism and national liberation movements.

Deliberately dramatizing the situation, the imperialist ideologues are promoting military power as the principal means of defending "Western

civilization." At the same time, they try to suppress the will of the peoples for peace and to raise a "man of war," readying to oppose the revolutionary forces of our time, arms in hand. It is to this purpose that the capitalist countries are encouraging a military psychosis and inflating a propaganda campaign to instill in the people the idea of the inevitability of a new war. The bourgeois mass media are tirelessly asserting the existence of a "Soviet threat," arguing in favor of some kind of economic "usefulness" of the arms race and the moral and military "acceptability" of nuclear war and sharply intensifying the psychological warfare waged against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Naturally, this concentrated influence on the consciousness of the masses does not vanish without a trace. It triggers in many people a feeling of pessimism, hopelessness and the idea of an inevitable nuclear conflict. Militaristic propaganda has its most fatal influence on the mentality and consciousness of the young generation. Poorly oriented in the difficult problems of foreign and military policy, many young men and women are unable to understand the reasons for the growth of international tension and to determine who actually threatens peace.

At the same time, the monstrous plans of the militaristic circles have triggered an explosion of active protest among all classes and population strata. The unparalleled scope of the antiwar movement, in the front ranks of which march the communists, convincingly proves the strength of the ideals of peace and the solidity of the democratic aspirations of the masses. The tremendous potential of the antiwar movement is not limited to its main task--the prevention of nuclear catastrophe. It is aimed at the threat of restoration of authoritarian regimes, with which the activities of conservative forces is fraught. The antiwar movement, which made a profound impact on political life in the capitalist world, contributed to the consolidation of democratic forces.

In its efforts to block the development of the global revolutionary process, contemporary capitalism is increasingly coordinating its efforts on an international scale. At the beginning of the 1980s an entire system of political interaction had developed in the capitalist world, covering all aspects of social life, from economics to ideology. Life has confirmed the accuracy of Lenin's statement that "the more we win the more the capitalist exploiters learn how to unite..." (op. cit., vol 40, p 244).

The internationalization of economic life and the process of political integration of the capitalist world are creating a closely tied system of ties and relations, the purpose of which, should this become necessary, would be to block the advance of progressive forces and erect a barrier on the path of the labor and communist movements. The new and considerably broader context within which the class battles are being waged in the capitalist world demands of the revolutionary forces a thorough consideration of the influence of international factors on domestic political developments. Lenin's stipulation that capital is an international force, the defeat of which "requires the international alliance among workers and their international fraternity" (ibid., p 43) is more relevant than ever today.



The activities of the communists become particularly important in connection with the aggravated capitalist contradictions. The struggle for peace and the prevention of nuclear catastrophe has become the most important task of the communist parties. In the period of structural crisis, noted by fierce class battles, the communists have proved themselves to be the only force which consistently defends the interests of the working people. It is countering the bourgeois divisive maneuvers with the struggle for unity within the working class and the alliance of labor against capital. The communists act also as true internationalists by mobilizing all forces to rebuff the turgid wave of chauvinism.

The worsened objective circumstances under which the communist parties operate and the contradictory nature of a number of phenomena and processes require the comprehensive and balanced assessment of the current phase in the development of bourgeois society. In this light, one of the main tasks of the Marxist-Leninists is to assess the possibilities of the further intensification of the structural crisis and its influence on domestic political life in contemporary capitalism. In particular, resolving the problem of the possible increase and limits of sociopolitical polarization taking place in bourgeois society is of major theoretical and practical significance. A serious analysis of the contemporary phase in the political development of state-monopoly capitalism is a necessary prerequisite for the elaboration of an effective alternative by the progressive forces and the worker and communist movements.

#### FOOTNOTE

1. From the Latin word "marginalis"--people on the edge. For example, according to NEWSWEEK, "Americans have learned to replace workers with equipment. However, they have not found as yet how, in using the new equipment, to return people to work" (NEWSWEEK, 18 October 1982, p 41).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## PROPAGANDA MYTHS AND HARD FACTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 90-98

[Article by Prof Vl. Afanas'yev, doctor of economic sciences, and R. Dzarasov]

[Text] The campaign of imperialist propaganda services "In Defense of Human Rights," directed from Washington, is a strategic ideological action. At the present stage its obvious purpose is to shield the development of a mad arms race, a drastic intensification of imperialist aggressiveness and a policy of confrontation with the global socialist system and the suppression of the worker and national liberation movements. Hardly accidental as well is the fact that this campaign coincides in time with the mounting of a broad onslaught by imperialist circles on remaining bourgeois democratic freedoms and the rights and interests of the working people in capitalist countries. Therefore, this campaign is the latest confirmation of the law that the more obvious the anti-people's nature of imperialism becomes, the more urgently its defenders feel the need to conceal it with the help of pseudodemocratic phraseology, falsifications and propagandist affectations.

However, even official bourgeois statistics, despite all its tricks, offers rich data showing the actual underlining of the campaign "In Defense of Human Rights," clearly indicating how far the broad declarations and promises of all its propagandists, starting with the President of the United States himself, are from the real state of affairs in a world ruled by cash. Noteworthy in this respect, for example, are the annual economic messages submitted by the U.S. President, bearing his personal signature. The figures and facts contained in such messages, despite all the efforts of their authors to polish them, provide a convincing picture of the true state of affairs in the richest country in the capitalist world, boasting of its "democratic nature."

What did the data contained in the economic messages of Jimmy Carter--the former Democratic Party president, who initiated an active propaganda campaign "In Defense of Human Rights" and of Ronald Reagan, the current Republican Party president, who extended this campaign in 1981-1984 reveal?

The most striking aspect of said document is, above all, the abundance of thunderous promises of ensuring America's economic future, the creation of more jobs, ensuring the well-being of all Americans, etc. Let us turn to the

statistical data cited in the report for, in the final account, they are more eloquent than words.

The electoral campaign in the United States is drawing to an end. The pendulum of the Republic propaganda machinery is in full swing. Once again the voter is in the center of a tremendous political show which creates the illusion of democrat elections: he is literally deafened by a flood of pledges and promises. Pictures of a cloudless future are painted and improved living standards for the Americans are forecast, allegedly guaranteed should the present occupant of the White House remain in his position.

Particular emphasis is put on the "successes" of the administration in the economic area. To be sure, this year unemployment and inflation have been somewhat reduced in the United States and the gross national product and the use of production capacities have been increased. On the surface, there is something with which to lure the Americans to the voting booths.

A closer look, however, clearly shows that the economic situation is hardly as brilliant as the defenders of the Reagan administration claim. For example, what is a publicized "success" such as a 7 percent increase in output for the first half of 1984 worth? The figure seems impressive only in comparison with 1983, when prerequisites for pulling out of the cyclical crisis were only maturing in the U.S. economy. A comparison with the level of the precrisis 1979 indicates that the growth was no more than 4.5 percent. This means that in 5 years the growth rates of output averaged 1 percent annually.

Unemployment is higher than the 1974-1975 crisis indicators. Price increases, restrained by the crisis, have intensified again and the budget deficit has exceeded the astronomical figure of \$200 billion. Realistically, the prospects for the future appear to be even less optimistic. The promise of the Republican administration to maintain a stable rate of economic growth can hardly be honored, for it is well-known that according to the laws governing the mechanism of the capitalist economy any upsurge is inevitably followed by a production decline, intensified by the economic burdens borne by the working people, including unemployment.

Whatever the bourgeois ideologues may be claiming on this matter, everywhere and under all circumstances the right to work has been one of the basic human rights, for it is precisely this right which is the source of means of subsistence for the working people. A person forced to sell his manpower on the "free" market, who loses his job and, after a certain period, his right to miserly unemployment benefits, can at best survive with the help of the degrading and unreliable system of public or private charity. Loss of job frequently entails loss of skill. It causes physical and moral pain to many people, sometimes ending tragically with the breakdown of the family, suicide, etc. All of this, one can say, is universally known.

How has the matter of employment stood in the United States under the Carter and Reagan presidencies? The facts are that whereas in the 1950s and 1960s total unemployment in the United States affecting annually 2.9 and 3.5 million people respectively (4.5 and 4.8 percent of the total labor force), according to official data it rose to 6.7 million (6.5 percent) under the Carter



presidency (1977-1980), while during the 3 following years of the Reagan presidency it averaged 9.9 million (8.8 percent). This means that compared with the 1950s unemployment rose by a factor of 2.3 under Carter and 3.4 under Reagan.

Almost one out of 10 U.S. workers was unemployed in 1982 and 1983. Naturally, average figures hardly show the full picture. In December 1982, for example, there were in excess of 12 million people totally unemployed, i.e., 10.8 percent of the labor force. Let us point out for the sake of comparison that in terms of the absolute indicator, that month unemployment had approached the level of the economic crisis of 1929-1933, which was the most profound and longest in the entire history of capitalism (there were 12.8 million unemployed in the United States in 1933).

As we know, unemployment does not mean total unemployment, for in reality it is increased by a significant partial unemployment. The official publication of the U.S. President's Council of Economic Advisers cites data according to which during the period of the most active campaign "In Defense of Human Rights" full and partial unemployment in the United States affected between 9 and 18 million working people. In December 1982 the figure reached 18.5 million, i.e., 16.6 percent of the total labor force.

Furthermore, judging by presidential messages, the dynamics of U.S. employment shows a clear trend toward a reduced share of short-term unemployment and, conversely, an increase in the share of long-term unemployment. Thus, whereas in 1978 the number of unemployed who had remained jobless for a period of 5 weeks or less accounted for 46.2 percent of the overall number, by 1983 it had dropped to 33.3 percent. During that period, however, the share of unemployed who had remained jobless for 27 or more weeks had risen from 10.4 to 23.9 percent. Therefore, unemployment became longer, increasing on an average from 14.3 weeks in 1977 to 20.5 weeks in January 1984. Bearing in mind that its average length was 11.5 weeks in the 1950s and 1960s, it becomes clear that for this indicator as well the right to work in the United States had been curtailed by the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s.

The economic messages of the U.S. President offer clear proof of open hiring and firing discrimination based on color, sex, age, etc. This sheds additional light on the problem of economic "human rights" under the capitalist social system in general and in the "most democratic" capitalist country in particular.

Over the past 7 years unemployment among the black population in the United States was more than double that among whites. Nonwhite workers were the first to be fired and the last to be hired. In December 1982, a month considered in President Reagan's economic message as the month which preceded the start of the economic upswing, the level of unemployment was 9.7 percent for whites and 18.8 percent for black. Despite a certain economic revival in the period which followed, in 1983 nonwhite unemployment had once again revealed a rising trend.

Youth unemployment has become extremely grave. Under the presidency of the spokesman "In Defense of Human Rights," unemployment among white young men and

women rose from 15 to 22 percent. The unemployment situation among black youths was even more dramatic. Here there was a clear case of double discrimination based on age and color. The economic messages cite data which show that unemployment among black youth exceeded the average unemployment level in the country by a factor of 4-5 and had risen from 38 to 44 percent during the last two presidential terms.

Naturally, statistical figures offer a partial, a limited idea of the hardships of unemployment. However, even such data show that such hardships actually affect the working class as a whole. For some they are manifested directly in loss of jobs and earnings with all the difficult consequences that this entails (let us point out in this connection that 23 million Americans experienced unemployment in 1981 and 27 million in 1982 and 1983). For others, this represents constant fear of losing their jobs, excessive increase in intensiveness and worsened labor conditions, reduced real wages, etc.

The data contained in the presidential economic messages fully confirm, therefore, the classic Marxist conclusion to the effect that under the capitalist economic system there cannot even be a question of guaranteeing the right to work. The policy of the capitalist countries, in this case of the largest imperialist state of our time, is aimed at depriving the working people of this right for the sake of monopoly superprofits.

## II

Naturally, in the final account it is not presidents who determine the course of the country's economic development which is governed by the objective laws of the capitalist economy. However, under the contemporary conditions of a highly developed state-monopoly capitalism, the policy of a bourgeois government can actively influence the economic situation. Such influence affects above all the redistribution of income among classes and social groups in the capitalist society. Both the Carter and Reagan administrations have done everything possible to shift the burden of the deep crisis in the American economy to the working people.

This is confirmed above all by the clear trend toward a lowering of real wages of the American working people in the 1970s and, particularly, the average weekly real wage in the nonagricultural sector of the U.S. economy dropped by 13.7 percent between 1972 and 1983. Between 1972 and 1976 it declined by 5.8 percent; starting with 1977, i.e., with the Carter presidency, and through 1983 it had declined by yet another 9.5 percent. Meanwhile, labor productivity in that sector, according to the official publication of the Presidential Council of Economic Advisers, had increased substantially: the hourly output per employed person had increased by 11.1 percent. This clearly shows the relative worsening of the situation of the working people, reflected in the dynamics of the ratio between the real wage and labor productivity. From 1972 to 1983 this relative indicator had declined 22.4 percent, of which 12.5 percent occurred over the past 7 years.

The dynamics of the indicator of the share of wages of industrial workers in terms of "value added by processing" irrefutably confirms the development of the relative worsening of the situation of the working class. Thus, according

to some authors, compared to 1972 in 1980 this share in the U.S. processing industry declined by 14.4 percent, including 4.5 percent in 1977.

As we know, this fact of relative worsening of the situation of the working class means that workers are being increasingly subjected to capitalist exploitation and that an increasing share of the goods they produce are appropriated without pay by the private owners of capital and controllers of working conditions.

This conclusion is fully confirmed by official data on the dynamics of capitalist profits. During the period under consideration (1970-1983), profits (before taxes) increased substantially from \$100.6 billion in 1972 to \$207.5 billion in 1983, i.e., they more than doubled. Unlike wages, which remained below the 1972 level throughout the entire period and showed a further declining trend, American corporate profits increased and substantially exceeded that level. In 1977, for example, i.e., only 5 years later, they were almost double the 1972 figure, rising to \$194.7 billion. By 1979 they were higher by a factor of 2.5 (\$252.7 billion). Although in subsequent years profits declined somewhat as a result of the cyclical overproduction crisis of the beginning of the 1980s, they nevertheless were substantially higher than the level reached during the crisis period of 1974-1975 (by 69 percent in 1981, 30 percent in 1982 and 54 percent in 1983).

The profits of the defense industry corporations were particularly high. This is not astounding, for the current American administration, which represents the interests of the right wing, of the most reactionary forces, is based above all on the military-industrial complex. That is precisely why it favors the intensification of militarism in literally all directions. Today Washington is stirring in connection with the new program for the development of "space weapons." According to American estimates, the corporations engaged in the production of such armaments should receive contracts for a total of up to \$2 trillion. Therefore, the profits of the defense monopolies, gigantic as it were, should "soar up" and reach truly "galactic" heights. Yet, even by Pentagon estimates, \$1 billion appropriated for defense production creates no more than 25,000 jobs in industry, compared to 76,000 in education and 85,000 in medical services. The arms race, which was drastically intensified by the Reagan administration, is one of the clear manifestations of the actual rightlessness of the American working people.

Unwittingly official U.S. government statistical data provide a glimpse of the true scale of the rightlessness of the toiling masses in terms of the appropriation of the wealth they have created. Actually, the "defense of human rights" slogan is nothing but a slogan of defending the enslavement of labor by capital and protecting the interests of moneybags.

### III

No picture of U.S. economic "human rights" would be complete without a discussion of the so-called "social expenditures," including "social aid." The very existence of the latter indicates that the poverty of millions of people is one of the most serious problems facing American society. Despite the efforts made by the U.S. ruling class in recent decades to reduce the



gravity of this problem, it remains the most typical feature of the American way of life.

Public, including "state," philanthropy remains the main source of existence for millions of Americans who are below the officially established poverty line (affecting the unemployed, the incapacitated, the old and other low-income individuals). This applies to aid to the unemployed, aid to low-income families with dependent children, food grants to the poor and children of poor families (food stamps, school lunches and so on), etc. Let us point out that such aid is frequently miserable and given by no means to all those who need it and, therefore, is accompanied by a degrading procedure of investigating their material situation.

Naturally, aid in cash and kind is the most important gain of the U.S. working people, achieved after a hard struggle. It is also the "price" which ruling America must pay in an effort to buy social peace. Historically, the aid system was brought to life by the "Great Depression" of 1929-1933. At that time, 15 million American families lived on the poverty level, which created a threat of a major social explosion.

To a certain extent, the system of aid to the most needy reduced the number of poor people. Quite naturally, however, it did not abolish poverty. By 1959 the number of Americans subsisting below the officially established "poverty level" was 39.5 million. By 1969 their number had declined to 25 million as a result of the "war on poverty" widely proclaimed by President Johnson.

The army of the poor has once again drastically increased today: in 1982 it affected 34.4 million people. By 1984 this figure had increased to 35 million.

Nevertheless, curtailing social benefits became one of the main trends in the economic policy of the Reagan administration. Such reductions affected a significant number of most important programs which are helping millions of Americans subsisting below the official "poverty level" to make ends meet. At the same time, expenditures for education, manpower retraining and ensuring employment were reduced by \$23.9 billion between 1981 and 1984 (in 1981 prices); allocations dropped by \$9.2 billion for environmental protection and by \$8.9 billion for area development projects. Under the pretext of preventing the waste of funds stricter regulations were passed on granting aid. As a result, compared with 1981, funds for food assistance to the poor were reduced by \$1.5 billion in 1982, \$181 million in 1983 and \$2.3 billion in 1984.

Reducing aid to the unemployed hits particularly hard the interests of the working people, considering the existence of a huge army of "surplus people" in the United States. Office of Management and the Budget Director, David Stockman, recently announced that social programs will be cut as a whole (in terms of 1984 prices) by \$30 billion (or by more than 20 percent) this year compared to 1979-1980.

"My economic program," Reagan declared, "is based on the fundamental stipulation that the government must respect, protect and broaden the freedom

and independence of the individual." The facts prove, however, that in reality this applies only to the rich social strata. The situation of individuals on the lower rungs of the social ladder is worsening substantially.

The cutting of social expenditures is a reflection of the major changes which are taking place in the foreign and domestic policies of the U.S. leading circles. The course charted toward aggravating the international situation and relying on the increased power of militarism and reaction within the country, as we pointed out, has become the alpha and omega of the policy of the current U.S. President. Led by extreme right-wing political forces, the Republican administration decisively revised budget priorities in favor of militarization. The following table cited in the 1982 U.S. presidential economic message shows the scale of changes made in some budget items.

Share of Individual Items in Budget Appropriations (in %)

	1975	1980	1981	1982	1983*	1987*
Goods, food and social aid	5.9	5.9	5.4	4.9	4.1	3.4
Education and vocational training	4.4	4.5	3.8	3.0	1.8	1.4
Military expenditures	24.5	21.5	22.2	23.8	27.0	35.4

\* Estimate

Therefore, between 1975 and 1983 the share of food and other types of social assistance in the budget declined by approximately 30 percent; allocations for education and vocational training were reduced by 59 percent. According to estimates, by 1987 these figures will be reduced respectively by 42 and 68 percent. Meanwhile, the share of military expenditures increased by 10.2 percent between 1975 and 1983 and will reach 44.4 percent by 1987.

It is entirely obvious that such a redistribution of national resources in favor of the military-industrial complex disastrously affects the situation of the working people. This is manifested with particular clarity in the case of the tax reform. It was primarily the upper social strata which benefitted from the tax reduction. In the future, in accordance with the plans of the present administration, their benefits would increase even more. According to the 1982 presidential economic message, in 1986 taxes would be reduced by 4 percent for individuals in the \$10,000 income bracket and 10 percent for the \$20,000 bracket, 15 percent for the \$30,000 bracket and 11 percent for the \$50,000 bracket. This will mean "savings" per taxpayer of, respectively, \$400, \$2,000, \$4,500 and \$5,500. The tax reform provides the greatest relief to the richest strata, as confirmed also by the reduced taxes on corporate income, which totaled \$64.6 billion in 1980 and had declined to \$37 billion in 1983.

America faces another extremely grave social problem in which all aspects of human economic rightlessness seem to be focused: poverty. Growing unemployment, decline in the level of real wages of working people, curtailed social benefits, the worsened situation of the farmers, etc., lead to the fact that an increasing number of Americans are sliding toward the lowest rung of the social ladder--below the already mentioned poverty line, as American official statistics politely describe the level below which hopeless want begins.

In the United States the so-called poverty line is determined officially. Individuals below that threshold are considered incapable of providing for themselves and their dependents a minimum of material goods as computed by the government, therefore necessitating social aid. A characteristic trend in U.S. social life in the past decade, under the Reagan administration in particular, has been the steady growth of this category of the poor, the number of which has increased by approximately 10 million people since 1975.

Poverty strikes the different ethnic groups to different degrees. Thus, among the official poor, compared to people of European stock, the figure is higher by a factor of 2.5 for Latin Americans living in the United States and by a factor of more than 3 among the blacks. Economic hardships to which capitalism subjects the working people--unemployment, reduced real earnings, increased cost of living, and so on--affect most strongly precisely these population groups. Children and the elderly are particularly hard hit by the consequences of poverty. It is precisely among them that the most crying examples of inhumanity, characteristic of a society which proclaims to be governed by "human rights," may be found.

Demographic processes give poverty a new face. The wave of divorces which spread in the United States in the 1970s has resulted in a drastic increase in the number of children raised by single parents. This is especially typical of the black population. Here the breakdown of families has increased from 172 cases per 1,000 marriages in 1971 to 225 in 1981, compared to an increase from 21 to 29 per thousand among whites. According to FORTUNE magazine, today 70 percent of the poor are "old, disabled or families raised by single mothers with at least one child of preschool age." For many of them the miserable social aid offers the only possibility of somehow making ends meet. Meanwhile, along with a reduction in the real amount of such aid, the number of people entitled to it is being reduced under one pretext or another. According to the Census Bureau, by 1981 29 percent of those below the poverty level received no aid whatsoever.

Therefore, the tragedy of poverty characterizes most clearly the problem of economic "human rights" in the United States.

#### IV

This description of the condition of economic "human rights" in the United States must be expanded by a consideration of the situation of the rural working people.



Noteworthy, above all, is the systematic drop in farm income. In current prices, farm net income at the beginning of the 1980s had declined by almost \$13 billion or 40 percent, or by 55 percent in terms of fixed 1967 prices. "By 1982 the gross income per farm family had declined by approximately 11 percent in real terms. More than two-thirds of farm family income came from nonfarming sources, whereas income from farming declined," the 1983 president's economic message noted.

The drop in income was due above all to inflation and the sharp price increases of goods bought by the farmers, paralleled by a drop in the price of farm produce on the American market. The price gap (wholesale prices) which developed was the main weapon for the onslaught mounted on the "economic rights" of U.S. farmers. Presidential economic messages dispassionately note that until 1982 farm prices had been rising somewhat; in 1982, however, they dropped to a level below that of 1980. Meanwhile, the price paid by the farmer for needed industrial commodities increased exceptionally rapidly. As a whole, between 1979 and 1983 prices of goods sold by the farmers increased by 3 percent while goods they purchased increased by 38 percent.

The sharp increase in bank interest rates in recent years became another factor in worsening the situation of the farmers. During that time interest on funds they borrowed reached 17 percent per annum, which "eroded" a considerable share of the already meager income from farming and contributed to the bankruptcy of a growing number of farmers.

The steadily mounting indebtedness of farm families as a whole confirms the worsening of farming conditions. Such indebtedness had been increasing for the past 20 years. However, it increased particularly sharply under the Reagan administration, jumping from \$136.5 billion in 1979 to roughly \$200 billion in 1982. The President himself was forced to acknowledge this in his 1983 economic message: "Farm indebtedness continued to rise and the ratio between indebtedness and farm property reached approximately 20 percent." Therefore, by granting loans to the farmers on usurious conditions, the banks have literally drowned them in debts.

The U.S. presidential economic messages most clearly show the rightlessness of the working people in the capitalist world, deprived of a guaranteed right to work and of the results of their toil, and subjected to exploitation and various types of discrimination. The presidential economic messages also convincingly prove that the campaign "In Defense of Human Rights," mounted by the imperialist circles, conceals a new stage in the onslaught mounted by the monopolies on the economic interests of the masses and the increased profits of military-industrial monopolies.

This leads to the following legitimate question: if the policy of the present American administration is so openly antipeople in nature, why is it that the social protest of the U.S. working people has not become widespread? One of the reasons is the familiar fact that by the turn of the 1980s both a foreign and domestic policy turn to the right took place in the United States. Not the least role in its ideological preparations was played by the extensive propaganda campaign "In Defense of Human Rights." It was persistently instilled in the average politically uninformed American that the socialist

system is the "empire of evil" which is the cause of all the troubles afflicting the "free world." It was suggested that a strong and firm policy should be pursued to counter the imaginary "global threat" to the West. All mass information media were extensively drawn into the implementation of this preplanned and thoroughly organized action.

As a result, changes desirable to the ruling circles are taking place in the mind of the average American, who lives in the world of mental cliches and stereotypes instilled in him by bourgeois propaganda. In yielding to the chauvinistic zeal of the campaign of the struggle "In Defense of Human Rights," waged throughout the world outside America, where the threat presented by "immoral communism" is expanding at a headlong pace, the tricked American petit bourgeois is not always aware of the onslaught mounted against his own rights and freedoms. He is frequently ready to support the intensification of militarization within the country and the increased aggressiveness of Washington's foreign policy.

The situation favorable to the ruling U.S. circles is also noted by a certain improvement in the economic situation in the country, which the demagogic publicity of "Reaganomics" presents as a panacea to the most grave conflicts within the capitalist economy. This upsurge, however, is merely the result of the advent of a certain phase in the cyclical dynamics of capitalist production, which must inevitably be replaced by an intensification of crisis processes. An intoxication with imaginary "successes" will unquestionably yield to the inevitable sobering up. The economic policy of the Republican administration will then show its true face to the American working people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## LOYALTY TO THE LENINIST BANNER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 99-105

[Review by Prof A. Yakovlev, doctor of historical sciences of the book "Leninskim Kursom Mira" [The Leninist Peace Course] by A. A. Gromyko. Selected speeches and articles. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 735 pp]

[Text] In the postwar decades the situation in the world arena has never been so tense as it is now. The future of mankind has become really threatened by forces which are trying to hinder social progress. This threat stems above all from the United States. The ruling circles in that country--a sui generis mother country of contemporary imperialism and one of the most powerful countries in the world--have raised power and violence to the level of a principle of their governmental policy in the international arena and unleashed an unrestrained arms race. They have tried to dictate their will to sovereign countries through terrorism and the force of arms.

History is familiar with many transitional periods during which social revolutions and new social relations have asserted themselves in the course of a lengthy and fierce struggle against the old obsolete order. Never before, however, has such a struggle been so comprehensive, waged on such a global scale or sharply raised the question of the fate not only of entire nations but of all intelligence on earth. The tasks of renovating the world on the basis of the principles of social justice and the liberation of man from all types of economic exploitation, social inequality, national oppression, poverty and rightlessness and his salvation from death in a nuclear war have become interwoven within an inseparable entity. The unparalleled increase in the aggressiveness in the U.S. leadership and its excessive ambitions and loss of ability soberly to assess the realities of the nuclear century are all worsening the situation which demands of all nations increased vigilance and greatly increases the responsibility of political and state leaders for the preservation and consolidation of peace.

In the complex and varied flow of world events today, as a great socialist power the Soviet Union acts with full awareness of its responsibility to the nations for their very future and for offering them the possibility of following their independently selected path of social development. "We are well aware of the threat which the thoughtless adventuristic actions of



aggressive imperialist forces create for mankind," Comrade K. Chernenko emphasized at the February 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "and speak of this most loudly in drawing the attention of the peoples throughout the earth to this threat."

Soviet foreign policy has firmly established its position as a powerful force affecting the development of international relations in a spirit of the ideas of peace and social progress. It has retained the characteristic features which were given to it by V. I. Lenin from the very first days of the Great October Revolution: class-oriented content, internationalism, democracy, humanism, support of peace and historical optimism. In close cooperation with the other peace-loving forces of our time, the Soviet Union is pursuing the difficult struggle for improving the international political atmosphere, which is of vital importance to the destiny of the nations. As was emphasized at the February Plenum, the Leninist policy of peace "is consistent with the basic interests of the Soviet people and, actually, the other peoples of the world. We firmly declare that we shall not retreat a single step from this policy."

The Leninist peace course is the leitmotif of the recently published new book by A. A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR minister of foreign affairs, on problems of international activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state. This book is a document of battle waged at the front end of the struggle for peace, security and social progress. It is the extension of the publication of speeches, reports and articles by the author which was started with the 1978 book "Vo Imya Torzhestva Leninskoy Vneshney Politiki" [For the Sake of the Triumph of Leninist Foreign Policy]. The present book covers the period from the end of the 1970s to the middle of 1984. It provides a comprehensive picture of international events of that period and a profound expanded Marxist-Leninist characterization of the contemporary stage in global developments.

Its author is a noted party and state leader of our country, and an outstanding Soviet diplomat-Leninist who has fruitfully toiled in the field of Soviet foreign policy for the past 45 years. It would be no exaggeration to say that there is no major foreign political action taken by our country during that period to the elaboration and implementation of which A. A. Gromyko has not made a substantial contribution in implementing the party's will. He is a recognized theoretician in the field of international relations and world economics and an outstanding propagandist of the Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

The author is especially familiar with the topic of the basic importance of the Leninist legacy in shaping, developing and implementing socialist foreign policy principles. This is understandable, for Lenin's thoughts and methodological instructions have been and will forever remain the linchpin of Soviet foreign policy and the foundation of Soviet diplomacy. Marxism-Leninism is a tried means which enables us clearly to see behind the variety of phenomena, facts and events which occasionally appear contradictory and quite disparate, the true essence of occurrences and the motive springs regulating the policy of one country or another.

"One cannot speak without admiration of the fundamental contribution made by Lenin to the formulation of the foreign policy of the land of the soviets and its diplomatic service," A. A. Gromyko writes. "This includes the elaboration of the strategy and tactics of this policy, the scientific prediction of the course of the revolutionary liberation struggle, the utilization of interimperialist contradictions and the masterly use of the entire arsenal of forms, means and methods of social diplomacy. Lenin's foreign political activities were and remain the most outstanding model of party-mindedness, high principle-mindedness and ability to assess in their inseparable and contradictory interconnection social, economic and political processes and phenomena and promptly to react to changes in the international circumstances, a model which has preserved its entire value" (pp 509-510).

In the article "The Leninist Principles of the Foreign Policy of the Soviet State," with which the book opens and which, unquestionably, gives it its meaning and sets its emotional tonality, A. A. Gromyko points out that in assessing one phenomenon or another in international life and resolving practical problems of foreign policy, Lenin invariably began with a systematic application of the class criterion. He taught us to seek the actual interests governing the actions of the bourgeoisie and its diplomacy. "V. I. Lenin," the author writes, "was able to identify the class core of any international problem, however well-concealed it may have been" (p 9).

A. A. Gromyko's book clearly describes the creative application of the Leninist legacy to contemporary foreign policy activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state. In following Lenin's tradition, the communist party, its Central Committee and Central Committee Politburo are always focusing attention on problems of international life and are daily directing the international activities of our country. This approach ensures the depth and substance of initiatives and decisions, continuity and high practical efficiency.

The growth of the economic and defense potential of the Soviet Union and its increased prestige and influence on international affairs open new opportunities for the fuller manifestation of the transforming and constructive nature of Soviet foreign policy and provide a source of vital strength and efficiency in defending the most humane objective and most vital requirement of our time--ensuring peace and social progress. The fact that for nearly 4 decades after the great victory over fascism no global military confrontation has been allowed to occur is to a tremendous extent the result of the systematic peaceful policy pursued by the USSR and the members of the socialist community, the author points out.

Inherent in A. A. Gromyko's works is a Leninist approach to the study of problems of foreign and domestic policy in their organic combination and dialectical interconnection. It is entirely natural, therefore, that the author particularly emphasizes the closest possible unity and indivisibility of the economic successes achieved by the Soviet people and the effectiveness of Soviet foreign policy. "Each new day of the growing socialist system," the author points out, "is directly subtracted from the period of bourgeois domination allowed by history. The metal welded by the workers, the grain

grown by the kolkhoz members, the discoveries made by scientists and the new frightening equipment mastered by our armed forces are weighty and convincing arguments which the Soviet people provide in support of our foreign policy" (p 10).

Lenin's words are more relevant today than at any other time in terms of the contemporary international situation: "The history of mankind is making today one of the greatest and most difficult turns of incomparable or, one could say without the least bit of exaggeration, universal-liberation importance" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 78). The growth of the economic and military potential of real socialism, its political influence and moral prestige and the foreign policy pursued by the majority of liberated countries aimed at safeguarding peace, ensuring national sovereignty and achieving true economic independence and the reorganization of the entire system of international economic relations on a just basis and the struggle waged by the worker and general democratic movements against the reactionary domestic and oppressive foreign policy of monopoly capital are all drastically curtailing the realm of imperialist rule and the maneuverability of capitalism. The processes of its major economic and political destabilization have been energized.

Every single day brings new proof of Lenin's prediction that socialism will become a powerful international force with "a decisive influence on world politics" (op. cit., vol 41, p 165). In his book A. A. Gromyko discusses extensively the topic of the steady strengthening of socialist international positions and the favorable influence which the peaceable policy of the members of the socialist community exert on contemporary global processes. "In the struggle for safeguarding and strengthening peace," the author points out, "together with the other members of the socialist community the Soviet Union is increasingly asserting itself as a powerful factor in exerting a positive influence on the course of global events" (p 657). Together with the other members of the socialist community, the Soviet Union counters the imperialist policy of a spiraling arms race with a consistent course of peace and international cooperation.

The book clearly proves that the strengthening of fraternal relations with the other members of the socialist community was and remains a priority trend in Soviet foreign policy. These countries are setting to the entire world an example of intergovernmental relations of a new type, based on the principles of socialist internationalism. Such relations rest on total equality, respect for the sovereignty of each country, mutual aid and comradely support and class solidarity.

Imperialist policy is doing everything possible to restrict the international influence of the socialist countries, which significantly determines the success of the efforts to safeguard and strengthen peace. They try to weaken the unity of these countries and the foundations of the socialist system, through one method or another, wherever they hope to be successful. Under those circumstances, the firm cohesion of the fraternal socialist countries is particularly important. Our bourgeois enemies, the author writes, "love to cause a stir" on the subject of isolated shortcomings or blunders in the course of socialist development itself and the process of development of



relations within the socialist community. In order to suit various fabrications, they fail to mention the fact that "a society based on exploitation, national discord and the oppression of one nation by another has left so many encrustations, including in relations among nations and states, that their elimination in one fell swoop is impossible" (p 11).

The innovative nature of socialist practices is manifested precisely in surmounting problems remaining from the past or arising in the course of progress, and the tangible commonness of the basic interests and objectives of the peoples and countries of the socialist commonwealth becomes quite tangible. A. A. Gromyko emphasizes that "it is only the active, conscious and purposeful efforts of the communist parties in power that strengthen among socialist countries relations imbued with the spirit of proletarian internationalism, unity and cooperation" (ibid.).

The fraternal countries deeply realize that their activeness, purposefulness and coordinated actions in the international arena largely determine the success of the struggle against the military threat presented by American imperialism. The exchange of views and elaboration of a joint line on topical contemporary problems are a continuing subject of talks among heads of fraternal parties and countries in the socialist community, above all within the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact members, where the international situation is studied profoundly and comprehensively and broad peace initiatives on the most urgent problems of global developments are formulated. The summit economic conference of CEMA members, which took place in Moscow in June 1984, was a major event in the life of the socialist community. The results of the conference were yet another demonstration of the unity, cohesion and inflexible will of the fraternal nations to go forth along their chosen way and to develop socialist economic integration as an important prerequisite for the all-round progress of CEMA member countries and for sparing no effort to eliminate the threat of nuclear war.

The Great October Revolution combined within a single stream the struggle of the proletariat for socialism with the movement against colonial oppression by peoples enslaved by imperialism. The coincidence of the basic interests of world socialism and the national liberation movement is the foundation of their solidarity in the struggle against imperialism and for freedom, independence, national self-determination and universal peace. Our country continues to consider as its international duty, A. A. Gromyko points out, support of the liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the struggle for strengthening the independence and sovereignty of the country in these parts of the world. It is precisely the Soviet Union which was able in the past to include in the United Nations Charter the stipulation of the equality and self-determination of nations, thus establishing the legal and political prerequisites for the subsequent actions taken by this prestigious and representative international organization in support of the national liberation struggle of oppressed peoples. The declaration on granting freedom and independence to colonial countries and peoples, which was adopted by the United Nations in 1960 on the initiative of the USSR, played an important role in the elimination of the imperialist colonial system. The land of the soviets remains inflexibly loyal to the

Leninist traditions of friendship and cooperation with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America and is giving them the aid they require.

In his book, A. A. Gromyko clearly and consistently promotes the idea that support of the national liberation struggle of the peoples and the elimination of hotbeds of tension in various parts of the world, systematically fanned by the forces of imperialism and hegemonism, is a major trend in the struggle for international security. The Soviet Union is on the side of those who to this day are forced to fight for freedom and independence and the very existence of their nations, and who are forced to repel the pressure of aggressive imperialist forces or are threatened with aggression on their part. No delusions whatsoever should exist on this account. On frequent occasions the decisive actions of the USSR have helped the fighters for national and social liberation to resist imperialist intervention in their domestic affairs.

As we know, monopoly propaganda is steadily, zealously and loudly waging a campaign to the effect that the USSR and the other members of the socialist commonwealth are "interfering" in the affairs of nations and countries in various parts of the world. Using the fictitious claim of the "Soviet menace," imperialism is essentially trying to conceal and perhaps somehow to justify all of its aggressive actions. A. A. Gromyko deals with the core of this matter with an extreme clarity which does not allow for any misinterpretation. "The Soviet Union," he emphasizes, "will systematically pursue a peaceable course in foreign affairs and a policy aimed at strengthening peace and detente. However, it will not allow anyone to encroach on its legitimate rights or harm the legitimate interests of our country, its allies and its friends" (p 141). The Soviet state and the CPSU have never supported nor will ever support the export of revolution. However, they will oppose just as firmly the export of counterrevolution, the "right" to which American imperialism claims for itself.

The book by A. A. Gromyko opens to the readers a broad view of contemporary international life in its entire complexity and variety. Its main feature is the confrontation between two trends: preserving and strengthening peace and its opposite, undermining its foundations. Along with the other socialist countries and the overwhelming majority of states, including those with different social systems, the Soviet Union steadily promotes peace. It is precisely Soviet foreign policy which plays the role of the main factor in strengthening peace the world over. The struggle waged by the CPSU and the Soviet people for restraining the nuclear arms race and improving the international situation is of the greatest importance in resolving problems of historical significance, such as ensuring for our country the necessary external conditions for the implementation of the constructive objective of building communism. By acting thusly, the land of the soviets also fulfills its supreme international duty to the global revolutionary process and the forces of social progress.

The principle of peaceful coexistence among countries belonging to opposing social systems, formulated by Lenin and practically implemented by the Soviet Union, offers reliable prospects for a lasting peace. However, peaceful coexistence neither excludes nor could exclude the class struggle for social conflicts. The class struggle is taking place and will continue in the

political and economic and, unquestionably, ideological areas, for the world outlooks and class objectives of the countries belonging to the two different social systems are opposed to each other and irreconcilable. The toiling masses will never accept an ideology of oppression and war, whereas the monopoly bourgeoisie does not intend to lay down its arms in the struggle for the preservation of its positions. While accusing socialism of ideological irreconcilability, the ruling imperialist forces are waging a frenzied psychological warfare against countries living in accordance with socialist laws and principles. Under these circumstances, the aggressive ideological struggle against the supporters of oppression, aggression and militarism plays an invaluable role in isolating the forces of war and exposing those who to this day have not abandoned the hope of stopping the march of history. The confrontation, however, should in no case develop into military conflicts, not to mention into a threat to the fate of humankind. This thought, which expresses the essence of the socialist policy of peace, is clearly formulated in A. A. Gromyko's books.

The CPSU and the Soviet state were forced to wage decades of persistent struggle before the principle of peaceful coexistence began to assert itself as one of the fundamental norms of intergovernmental relations and for a turn from cold war to detente and mutually profitable cooperation to take place in international relations. During the 1970s, political contacts were comprehensively developed among countries with different socioeconomic systems. Dozens of treaties and agreements were initialed and mutually profitable relations in trade-economic, scientific and technical, cultural and other areas increased substantially. A number of bilateral and multilateral documents have confirmed the universal conviction that in a nuclear century no foundation for intergovernmental relations other than peaceful coexistence is possible.

The period of detente, A. A. Gromyko emphasizes, was by no means an accidental happenstance in the difficult history of the 20th century. The nations fully realize the advantages of the policy of detente and care for its results. It was important to strengthen and multiply everything positive achieved in international relations during the 1970s and to strengthen mutual trust and develop equal cooperation among countries regardless of their social system. However, Washington preferred to take a sharp turn in its international course toward confrontation and fanning tension throughout the world and a chauvinistic atmosphere within the country.

All of this requires new efforts--economic, defense and political--to protect the world and stop the sliding of humankind toward the precipice of doom. Even under these circumstances, however, what types of specific relations may be developing between our country and the capitalist states, the Soviet Union will continue systematically to follow a line in which the principle of peaceful coexistence, which remains the foundation of the Soviet course in the world arena, prevail in relations among countries with different social systems.

Under the present circumstances a problem of universal significance is in the center of attention of the international activities of the USSR and the other members of the socialist community: rescuing the peoples from the threat of



war, preventing the forces of aggression from turning our planet into a desert burned down by a nuclear fire and strengthening the foundations of universal peace. "Having specific scientific data on what the use of nuclear weapons involves," notes A. A. Gromyko, "we cannot formulate today a policy based on the obsolete medieval concept according to which disputes based on conceptual differences among countries and peoples can be resolved by the fire and the sword. It would be absurd to believe that on the threshold of its third millenium humankind, wizened by experience, having suffered a number of tragedies in the past, would be unable to find a solution to the current grave international problems and to resolve them through civilized and peaceful means" (p 709).

Yet it is precisely the policy of the fire and the sword, imbued with the ideas of hegemonism and excessive imperial ambitions, which is pursued today by official Washington, whose purpose is to eliminate in favor of the United States the existing military-strategic balance, achieve a dominating position in the world and, relying on force, dictate its will upon others. A. A. Gromyko subjects to profound study and comprehensive and substantiated criticism the foreign policy course charted by Washington, where the most reactionary and aggressive wing of the American monopoly bourgeoisie and the country's political forces hold sway.

The already tense situation, which is the result of the new round of unrestrained arms race unleashed by the Pentagon, and the policy of encroachments on the rights and interests of other nations worsened even further as a result of the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Western Europe, which inaugurated a particularly dangerous phase in the nuclear arms race. The appearance of first-strike missiles on European soil has weakened the security of the countries where such missiles are placed and turned them into "nuclear hostages" of the United States. This was the reason for the worsening of the political climate and for raising the level of military confrontation, and not in Europe alone. With its irresponsibility and with the thoughtless connivance of some Western European leaders, the U.S. administration wrecked the Geneva talks, the purpose of which was to limit and substantially to reduce nuclear armaments.

The efforts of the Reagan administration to shift the arms race to space are also aimed at achieving military-strategic superiority and at making preparations for nuclear war. "The militarization of space and its conversion into an arena of unrestrained arms race is a heavy crime which is being prepared in front of the entire world," the author points out. "The implementation of such plans would be a threat which will be hanging over humankind as a sword which could strike at any minute. In this case adventurism borders on insanity. Anyone who looks sensibly at things realizes that it is easier to agree on limiting one type of weapon or another when it is only in the planning stage and even easier when it does not exist at all. It becomes much more difficult when it is already in production, and even more so after its deployment" (p 706).

Constant threats, "punishments" and "sanctions" have become constant features in the current U. S. policy. The United States proclaims as a sphere of its "vital interests" ever new areas on earth. It is inflating hotbeds of war and

violence and impudently violating the rights of entire nations. Not limiting itself to blackmail and threats, Washington is also resorting to open aggression: the piratical attack on Grenada, the barbaric actions of the American military in Lebanon and the undeclared war waged on the people of El Salvador and on Nicaragua and Afghanistan are the record of Washington's latest actions. The "troubadours of militaristic policy," the author points out, "have invented their own special morality, the norms of which are consistent with everything which suits Washington. This makes moral the use of weapons, whether war has been declared or not. This makes terrorism perpetrated against other nations moral. This makes moral all types of subversive activities against other countries. All of this is firmly part of official U.S. policy" (ibid.).

The electoral platform of the Republican Party, adopted at the party's August 1984 convention, was an open and cynical defense of the piratical foreign political course pursued by the ruling U.S. group. It cannot be described as other than a cluster of hatred for all other nations and a hymn to chauvinism, militarism and war. This document confirmed once again the accuracy and relevance of the warnings issued by the leader of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and realistically thinking political and social personalities in different countries, including in the United States itself, about the danger which such thoughtlessness in future plans formulated by the ruling party in Washington presents to the entire world.

The scientific analysis contained in some sections of the author's definitive work "Vneshnyaya Ekspansiya Kapitala. Istoriya i Sovremennost" [The Foreign Expansion of Capitalism. History and Contemporaneity], which are included in this work, is a further development of the topic which is of such great importance in understanding the basic springs motivating the increased aggressiveness in the policy of American monopoly capital under the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism. This work sums up the results of A. A. Gromyko's long study of one of the most topical problems of contemporary capitalist political economy. The best features of this scientific research are a description of the interconnection and dialectical interdependence among economics, politics and diplomacy and the study of the ties between the methods of monopolistic expansion in the past and the new features of this process reflecting contemporary global developments. They are characterized by the fact that science and practice, considered in a state of organic unity, multiply the power of the arguments, their persuasiveness and the depth of understanding of the laws governing global developments.

Problems related to concretizing and explaining the constructive nature of the peace-loving Soviet proposals play an important role in the book as well. As we know, the Soviet Union has formulated a number of proposals of basic significance covering all key trends in international politics. The various aspects of the problem of ensuring international safety and the struggle for restraining the arms race, disarmament and lasting peace on earth are noted for their broad range, profound content and lofty humanism. The USSR systematically calls for productive talks on limiting and reducing nuclear armaments on the basis of the equality and equal safety of the sides. Our country calls for reaching agreements on an entire set of measures which could

truly lower the level of military confrontation and exclude the use and threat of force in international life.

The foreign policy of the Soviet state and its diplomatic practices have always been distinguished by the honesty of their intentions, weighty and substantiated proposals and scrupulous observance of agreements. The tremendous positive volume of accomplishments of Soviet foreign policy and its loyalty to the spirit and the letter of assumed obligations allow the author with full justification to pit the socialist principles of diplomacy against bourgeois politicking which agrees to one thing in a treaty but does something different.

The Soviet Union unilaterally assumed the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and called upon the United States and the other nuclear powers to follow its example. Had all nuclear powers assumed the same obligation, the danger of nuclear war would have been reduced significantly. Trust would be strengthened and conditions for a radical reduction in the level of nuclear armaments would be created.

The major initiative formulated by the Soviet Union together with the other fraternal countries of concluding a treaty on reciprocal nonuse of military force and maintaining relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact and the members of North Atlantic Alliance is imbued with concern for restoring trust in relations among countries. The idea of concluding such a treaty is becoming increasingly relevant and rooted in the minds of the broad public.

The latest major Soviet proposals as well are dictated by the sincere desire to improve the international climate and to remove the threat of war from the life of mankind. This applies to norms governing relations among nuclear powers, the prevention of militarization of space and the banning of chemical weapons. The solution of these problems is consistent with the interests of all countries and the demands and hopes of the nations.

Taking into consideration the current situation in the world, today more than ever before decisive steps must be taken to prevent a nuclear war. Our country, A. A. Gromyko points out, proceeds from the fact that "real possibilities exist for a serious discussion of problems the solution of which would improve the situation in the world, correct the dangerous list in world affairs and return them to a normal development course" (p 660).

The book of selected speeches and articles by A. A. Gromyko is a profound and comprehensive description of the multifaceted activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state in the international arena and their titanic struggle for the triumph of the cause of peace and social progress on earth. The concepts formulated in the book are a substantial contribution to the development of theoretical and practical problems of contemporary international relations and the Leninist foreign policy course.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2



## SELF-AWARENESS OF SCIENCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 105-109

[Review by G. Smirnov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, of the book 'Filosofiya i Nauchnoye Poznaniye' [Philosophy and Scientific Knowledge] by P. N. Fedoseyev. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 464 pp]

[Text] The new book by Academician P. N. Fedoseyev is a comprehensive study of the development of the social, natural and technical sciences and the role of Marxist-Leninist philosophy as a reliable foundation for the process of interaction among the various trends of knowledge under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution and the extensive social renovation of the world. It covers topical problems of building socialism and communism and the tense confrontation between the two sociopolitical systems--socialism and capitalism--as well as the struggle for safeguarding peace on earth and against the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

The monograph is divided into three parts. The first deals with the structure of world outlooks and their types, the place and functions of philosophy in the world outlook system, the specifics of philosophical knowledge, the conceptual function of socioscientific knowledge and the role of philosophy in the implementation of this function. The second part deals with the philosophical interpretation of the latest data in modern natural sciences and their development from the viewpoint of strengthening the ties between dialectical-materialistic philosophy and the entire set of contemporary sciences of nature and the problems of interaction between man and nature. The third part is dedicated to the methodology of social knowledge, philosophical problems of the theory of the historical process, with an emphasis on determining the dialectics of the contemporary epoch, the building of socialism and communism and the world revolutionary process.

Let us note above all some common problems reflected in all three parts of the book and on which the author expresses a number of interesting views, quite significant in the development of contemporary science as a whole and philosophy in particular.

Naturally, he is interested above all in the interconnection and reciprocal dependence between philosophy and the specialized sciences under contemporary

conditions. In his view, the characteristics of their formulation and development are based, above all, on the conversion of science into a direct and leading production force and the steady increase of its significance in terms of the social and cultural progress of mankind and the urgent need for a philosophical interpretation of the world and man's place in it in connection with the increased complication of the processes of global development and the acceleration of scientific and technical progress (see p 7).

The author promotes the thesis of science as a leading production force. We believe that this concept does not conflict with the traditional understanding of production forces (man plus production tools) although it needs a more detailed description and clarification; science multiplies the creative forces of the worker and becomes embodied in personality and material production facts. The conversion of the economy to intensive development stems to a decisive extent from the development of science and the use of its achievements in production. It is precisely science which has the final word in the discovery of new materials, which are extremely necessary for the national economy yet are not found in nature, the development of new technologies and efficient means of economical utilization of energy resources, the development of computer and information equipment, etc. All of this requires a proper attitude toward science and the problems of its organization, financing, etc. The efficient application of scientific recommendations is precisely what is frequently lacking in current national economic practice, as is repeatedly pointed out by the CPSU Central Committee.

According to the author, the dialectics of the development of the cognitive process itself has a tremendous influence on the increased interest shown by philosophy and the individual sciences in their interaction (see pp 7-8). The interpretation of the historical experience of the development of the entire set of sciences dealing with nature and society and their latest results are the vital base and source of development of philosophical knowledge. The development of the natural sciences, which has been of tremendous importance in improving and developing the dialectical-materialistic outlook and methodology, from the outstanding natural scientific accomplishments of the 19th century (discovery of the law of transformation of energy, the cellular structure of animate matter, Darwin's theory of evolution) to the theory of relativity, quantum mechanics, breaking the genetic code and the deep penetration into the neurophysiological mechanism of functioning of the brain. We find in the book a thorough characterization of the conceptual-methodological functions of philosophy and its scientific-heuristic, synthesizing and value-regulating role (see pp 70-74). Dialectical-materialistic philosophy shapes the self-consciousness of science and contributes to the better understanding of its capabilities, prospects, mechanisms and motive forces of growth of scientific knowledge and the nature of its interrelationships with other forms of social consciousness, way of life and culture (see pp 8-10). Philosophy also plays a leading role in intensifying contacts between the natural and technical sciences and the humanities.

The growing significance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy at the present stage is also determined by the fact that dialectical materialism is essentially a philosophical concept of the revolutionary renovation of the world and a

comprehensive theory of social progress. As a result of the universal historical changes which have taken place in recent decades a new historical reality has appeared, with its specific fast rates of development, the coexistence of different economic, social and cultural structures in the world, the variety of transitional forms and the aggravation of contradictions in social progress. The successes achieved by socialism in the USSR and the strengthening and further development of the world socialist community are of prime importance among these processes (see pp 13-14). All of this offers extensive data for philosophical considerations and theoretical summations. We find throughout the book interesting considerations which affect, one way or another, the problems mentioned here.

The problems of the nature of the world outlook and its functions and the correlation between outlook and philosophical and specialized scientific knowledge, morality and art, considered in the first part of the book, determine the approach to the other problems discussed in the work. The problem of the correlation between world outlook and philosophy, analyzed by the author, is of particular interest.

He points out that world outlook means a system of summed-up concepts of the world as a whole, the natural and social processes occurring within it and the attitude of the person toward reality surrounding him (see p 17). The world outlook provides a set of initial values and postulates which influence the behavior and way of life of classes, social groups and individuals. Hence the essential role which it plays in scientific knowledge and social practice. In proving the groundlessness of a negativistic attitude toward the role of world outlook in science, the author recalls the statement by Max Planck: "The researcher's world outlook will always define the direction of his work" (p 49).

A world outlook is a complex, comprehensive and multiple-level formation. It includes scientific data on nature and society and views on morality, law, literature and art. It is philosophy, which is the nucleus, the pivot of the world outlook, which helps to develop an overall concept of the world. However, "by no means every philosophical and theoretically substantiated world outlook," the author emphasizes, "is also a scientific outlook, in precisely the same way that not all theories are scientific. The property of 'theoretical nature' characterizes essentially the form of organization of knowledge, whereas the attribute of science is above all an essential characteristic of knowledge from the viewpoint of its attitude toward objective reality" (p 20).

A decisive prerequisite for conversion to a theoretically substantiated scientific outlook is the transformation of philosophy itself into science. Philosophy became a science in the full meaning of the term only with the advent of dialectical materialism, which marked the peak of centuries of development of philosophical thinking. The philosophical substantiation of the data provided by science and social life led Marx to the elaboration of the theory of socioeconomic systems and the legitimate revolutionary transformation of one system into another. "The Marxist-Leninist concept of the historical process, based on the concept of the socioeconomic system," the author writes, "became the inviolate foundation for scientific knowledge of



social phenomena" (p 42). The philosophical-materialistic foundation of the communist world outlook provides a profoundly scientific nature and objective substantiation to the theory of the class struggle waged by the proletariat, the socialist revolution and the building of socialism and communism (see p 22).

The monograph extensively describes the significance of the proper solution of the problem of world outlook and its structure, the role which philosophy plays in it and the elimination of a nihilistic attitude toward its conceptual functions. The author justifiably emphasizes that in assessing the role of a world outlook and philosophy nihilism has a clearly manifested social sense and is tightly related to the preaching of "pluralism" in philosophy and politics, i.e., the preaching of a multiplicity of "truths" and "equal values" of different ideologies and political trends. The feature of contemporary "pluralism" is defined by the growth of its anti-Marxist and antisocialist trend. The idea of "pluralism," as the author convincingly proves, has been adapted to serving the interests of the big bourgeoisie above all. The monograph provides a thorough study of the gnosiological and social roots of this ideology and sets the task of its further specific historical study and exposure.

In considering the problems of the correlation among concepts, morality, world outlook, philosophy and art, the author proves that the interaction among the different forms of social consciousness is a factor of an integral world outlook. Cultural-moral values include both a specific class content, determined by the special position of classes, as well as the general norms and rules of community life and universal values. The morality and culture of the working class inherit, critically rework and further develop everything that is best in the universal cultural and moral stock of mankind and enrich human civilization (see p 83). The shaping of a comprehensively developed harmonious individual, which is the objective of communism, presumes the mastery of this stock.

The author considers in detail topical problems of development of socialist culture in general and art and literature in particular. He describes the characteristics of artistic, as against scientific, creativity, criticizes formalistic aesthetics and proves the increased role of a scientific outlook in the development of literature and the arts.

Particularly interesting is the part dealing with philosophical problems of the natural sciences. Based on the Leninist principles of philosophical analysis of the natural sciences at the turn of the 20th century, P. N. Fedoseyev considers in detail the new and latest trends in the development of the natural and technical sciences, which have become particularly clear under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution. He indicates the significance of the new discoveries and trends in scientific development in terms of understanding social progress in general and the philosophical interpretation of such processes in particular.

The study of the philosophical problems of the natural sciences, which are becoming steadily richer, is closely related in the book to the identification of the general laws, the trends of the development of the science of nature,

during the period of the scientific revolution in particular. The consideration of such laws and trends is a mandatory condition for the further development of the theory of dialectics. This analysis is of both theoretical and practical significance, for it enables us to clarify the specific means through which the ideals and principles of dialectical materialism have influenced scientific and cognitive activities. In describing the specifics of contemporary research in this area, the author emphasizes that along with a determination of the methodological role of dialectical materialism in the development of the system of scientific-cognitive activities, the sociocultural determination of knowledge, which takes place, in particular, through a system of postulates and premises and regulatory agents of scientific research (style of thinking, the natural-scientific picture of the world, the norms and ideals of knowledge, methodological principles, etc.), assumes increasing importance today (see p 137). The development of scientific knowledge shows the need to single out the various levels and types of methodological study of the philosophical problems of the natural sciences. Taking the specifics of the studied subjects under consideration helps the analysis of the dialectics of interaction between philosophical and specific scientific methodology.

The book provides a comprehensive analysis of one of the crucial problems in the philosophical and natural scientific interpretation of objective reality: the structure of matter and its development. Twentieth-century natural science is inconceivable without development ideas. It is on its basis that concepts are implemented on the hierarchical structure of the organization of matter and the developed levels of this organization. In studying the interaction and interconnection among such levels, those between the macro- and microworlds and cosmic objects and elementary particles in particular, the natural sciences rely on the philosophical theory of the forms of motion of matter, which is enriched along with the progress achieved in the natural sciences.

This section offers a profound study of the most important methodological problems of contemporary science, which arise in connection with the intensive integration and differentiation of scientific knowledge, and which reveals their gnosiological foundations. The strategic task of philosophy is the elaboration of specific methods for implementing the dialectics of unity and variety in the course of the development of scientific knowledge and the comprehensive dialectical-materialistic study of the new situation which has developed in the "man-nature" system.

Unquestionably, the reader's attention will be drawn to two sections in this part: "Man and Nature Under the Conditions of the Scientific and Technical Revolution" and "The Problem of the Social and the Biological." The first is a Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the contemporary ecological situation, proving the groundlessness of bourgeois concepts and emphasizing the efficiency of the socialist utilization of nature. The author describes the concern of scientists for the need to "change the course" of the scientific and technical revolution in the direction of a fuller consideration of ecological development principles (see p 205). The second section deals with the complex philosophical problems of contemporary biology and its ties with the humanities. The development of biology, the author proves, leads to

general philosophical problems and raises a number of sharp conceptual questions.

Particular attention is paid to the problem of the correlation between the social and the biological. P. N. Fedoseyev, who criticizes the various concepts of genetic predetermination of the class struggle and the biological "substantiations" of racism and apartheid, proves that no data exist to confirm the idea that man's biological features present an insurmountable obstacle to social progress and the assertion of the principles of humanism (see p 223). In discussing the correlation between the social and the biological, he emphasizes that there is a similarity, a continuity and a link but also a radical distinction between these two levels of organization of matter. It is on this basis that he criticizes biologizing trends and efforts found in works on "sociobiology" to ignore the specifics of social laws which determine social phenomena (see p 238).

The author also cautions, however, that it would be simplistic to underestimate the importance of human biological features and to block the way to the study of human biology and genetics. On the basis of the classical principles of the Marxist-Leninist solution of the problem of the correlation between the biological and the social, P. N. Fedoseyev notes that "despite their full interdependence, the biological and the social are quite different areas of life. Each of them has its specific laws. A denial of qualitatively specific phenomena, levels and areas of life is as groundless and dangerous as the lack of understanding of the unity of the world and the interconnection among all phenomena and the continuity and interchangeability of the various forms of matter dynamics" (p 239). The systematic proof offered in support of this concept, based on specific scientific data, is an unquestionable quality of the monograph under review.

In the third and final part the author discusses the methodology of social knowledge, the philosophical problems of the theory of the sociohistorical process, the dialectics of the contemporary epoch, the world revolutionary process, the strengthening of the socialist community and the constructive activities of the communist party and the Soviet people.

He describes in detail the role of the social sciences in general and of philosophy in particular in the elaboration and substantiation of CPSU strategy and tactics. It is only under the conditions of socialism, as a system based on the planned development of economic, sociopolitical and spiritual life, that for the first time an essential correlation develops between social progress and the state of the social sciences. The comprehensive substantiation of this concept is summed up in the conclusion on the three basic functions which social sciences must perform under socialism, namely:

First, the theoretical knowledge and expression of the laws of the establishment of the communist system and the processes of intensification of the general crisis of capitalism and development of the world revolutionary liberation movement;



Second, the elaboration, for the benefit of the leading bodies, of recommendations and suggestions which contribute to the solution of topical problems of economic and social development and state and cultural construction, international relations and foreign policy;

Third, the development of the conceptual and theoretical content of socialist ideology dominant in society and the formulation of the scientific foundations for sociopolitical and ethical views and convictions and the exposure and criticism of bourgeois ideology (see pp 262-263).

In discussing the need for a decisive turn by Soviet social scientists and all scientific institutions toward the most topical practical problems, the author emphasizes that in this case the main link is the development of dialectical materialism as the only reliable and effective method of knowledge and philosophy of the theory of the revolutionary renovation of the world (see p 263).

One of the main problems in the development of the dialectical-materialistic methodology of social knowledge is the study of specific historical forms of manifestation of the law of unity and struggle of opposites in the contemporary epoch. The June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum drew the party's attention to the question of contradictions as a motive force of social progress in general and a motive force in the development of socialism and the gradual transition to communism in particular. The monograph notes that it is a question above all of the study of the new forms of struggle of opposites in global development, the new types of contradictions in the establishment of the communist system and the study of their nature and characteristics governing their appearance and means for their elimination. The author extensively considers contradictions under socialism and analyzes Lenin's concepts of antagonistic and nonantagonistic contradictions and criticizes erroneous viewpoints in this area.

The contemporary epoch offers extremely rich data for theoretical summations. Dialectical materialism is the philosophical concept of the revolutionary renovation of the world and the most purposeful theory of social progress. Its use in the study of social processes, the author emphasizes, is particularly important today. The point is that today's reality encompasses problems never previously encountered by mankind and introduces new features in the conditions and nature of the class struggle.

The author considers the prospects of the development of production forces in contemporary capitalism and emphasizes Lenin's concept that it would be an error to think that the trend of its decay excludes growth. Tracing historically the correlation between the socialist and the scientific and technical revolution, P. N. Fedoseyev writes that in a number of countries the socialist revolution preceded the scientific and technical revolution while the opposite occurred in others. In both cases, however, the variant of social development of the scientific and technical revolution is an organic component in the creation of the material prerequisites of a communist society (see p 292). Although a great deal has been written on the problems of the scientific and technical revolution, the author believes that the study of social consequences should be substantially broadened and deepened.

The theoretical problems of building and perfecting socialism play a particular role in the study of the dialectics of social development. The author notes that socialism is not an intermediary short stage between capitalism and communism. It is a separate, rather long phase of economic, social and political development of the communist system consisting, according to the author, of two basic periods: the stage of essentially built socialism and the developed (mature) socialist society.

The book covers the characteristics of the economic development of socialism at the present stage. The main features of economic growth in the last decade has been a conversion from extensive to intensive forms of economic management and the optimizing of the entire economic structure. He emphasizes that along with achievements in this area a tremendous number of unresolved problems remain, the study of which is the direct task of economists and other social scientists (see p 375).

One of the most topical tasks is the study of problems of the methodology and theory of planning and management. The author describes the difference between the principles of socialist planning and bourgeois programming models.

In considering problems of the sociopolitical and spiritual growth of socialist society, P. N. Fedoseyev notes the significant progress made in the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the means of developing an increasingly homogeneous social structure. He indicates the need to consider as relatively independent stages the surmounting of interclass differences in their main and essential aspect and the total elimination of vestiges of class differences (see p 382). The author also describes the social significance of agroindustrial complexes.

The monograph proves the increased need for the formulation of a broad conceptual-methodological approach to problems of universal human value, including that of war and peace. The creative application of dialectics enables us to encompass from a single viewpoint the multiple levels of the historical process and its truly contradictory complexity. Unlike concepts in which the conflict between the two world socioeconomic systems is interpreted in the spirit of an absolute division of the world and humankind into two autonomous and internally unrelated historical trends, obeying different historical laws, the dialectical-materialistic method directs the researcher toward realizing not only the antagonism but the eternal unity and integrity of contemporary history (see p 422).

P. N. Fedoseyev's book covers an exceptionally broad range of problems. Naturally, some of them have been discussed more thoroughly than others and some have been merely outlined. This applies to the problem of philosophy as the logic and theory of knowledge of social phenomena. Nevertheless, the philosophical-conceptual and social problems considered in Fedoseyev's book reveal the inexhaustible creative strength of Marxism-Leninism and its close

ties with reality. This book, which was received by the scientific public with a great deal of interest, will unquestionably be useful in the further philosophical interpretation of new phenomena and problems created by social practice and scientific knowledge.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2



## DIALECTICS AND LOGIC OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 110-117

[Review by Prof A. Kharchev, doctor of philosophical sciences, of the book "Istoricheskiy Materializm. Problemy Metodologii" [Historical Materialism. Problems of Methodology]. By L. F. Il'ichev. Nauka, Moscow 1983, 255 pp]

[Text] Each new stage in the history of real socialism, the class struggle of the proletariat and the national liberation movement in the capitalist world confronts the social sciences and historical materialism, which is their methodological foundation, with new theoretical problems and requires new forms of their ties with practice, consistent with the changing situation.

At the same time, in both our theoretical and practical work we follow untrodden paths, encounter not always predictable problems and do not immediately find impeccably accurate solutions. It would be utopian to hope for a certain immediacy and absolute impeccability of our searches, for it is a question of the knowledge and control of most difficult social processes in which the truth cannot be reduced to the simple reflection of facts, for which reason its determination and investigation take place through the accumulation, selection and correction of a mass of relative and partial knowledge.

The need for such scientific theoretical activities is particularly relevant today, when the CPSU and the entire country are preparing for the 27th Party Congress and the discussion of the new text of its program and bylaws. "To us, communists, preparations for the congress are a period of interpreting and summing up achievements, a period of actively consolidating everything positive we have accomplished. It is also a time for drawing lessons from errors and for a self-critical analysis of shortcomings and for defining means to surmount them and, above all, for resolving the new major problems." This statement by Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, at the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, are a manual for action for all social scientists in the country and one more reminder of the basic incompatibility between creative Marxism-Leninism and scholastic theorizing and the party's demand of turning the social sciences toward practice and seeing to it that they always proceed from existing reality, with all its positive and negative aspects, identifying more completely with

objective laws of social development and promptly "detecting" ripening trends. The most important thing is that "the social sciences must be steadily guided by revolutionary theory and skillfully apply the tried Marxist-Leninist methodology of scientific research."

The basic principles of this methodology are described in this new book by Academician L. F. Il'ichev. The work sums up some results in the development of Marxist-Leninist social science in recent decades, singles out positive accomplishments in this area, notes and analyzes errors and shortcomings and earmarks the most promising trends and ways of resolving most important problems arising in the course of improving developed socialism. Exceptionally important in this light is one of the main conclusions drawn by the author that "historical materialism and contemporary social sciences as a whole are entering a new development period" (p 106).

As asserted throughout the book, some of the main characteristics of this period are, on the one hand, the elimination of the vestiges of dogmatism and scholasticism in the social sciences and, on the other, outliving that which could be described as theoretical dilettantism, in which "innovation" becomes self-seeking and ties to practical problems are reduced merely to naming them and, sometimes, relishing negative phenomena with "witticisms," without any serious efforts to study their reasons and to sum up the experience in the struggle against them. The contemporary stage in the building of socialism and the ideological struggle require creative and innovative studies. However, theoretical creativity and innovativeness themselves presume a profound factual respect for scientific conclusions tested through historical practice and respect for the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and its so-called elementary truths.

L. F. Il'ichev's work is a convincing example of such respect and, therefore, a creative approach to resolving on the basis of contemporary scientific data the basic methodological problems of historical materialism and all social sciences, from the correlation between the categories of the socioeconomic system and stages in the real historical process to the typology of social studies.

However, this aspect of the theoretical-methodological content of the monograph has already been identified and positively rated in reviews published in social science works. Therefore, as we join in this assessment, we would like to develop and additionally substantiate it, drawing attention to the opportunities which this book provides in refining and intensifying not only the general and basic but a number of derived and more specific concepts of historical materialism—and, in this connection, the further concretizing of its subject, structure and place in the social science system.

"...The level of problems related to historical materialism is most general. Yet the most general problems of the theory of social development are always considered on the basis of specific conceptual positions, i.e., they inevitably assume a philosophical nature... However, even individual problems in the social sciences may assume a general philosophical and general conceptual appearance. Hence the significance of historical materialism which resolves the main philosophical problems applicable to society and identifying

the nature of the historical process and its laws" (pp 189-190). This summation is an interpretation of experience in the development of historical materialism and the methodological nucleus of all Marxist social science and formulates the initial theoretical stance in defining the structure of social knowledge as a whole. In order to concretize this position, we must above all concentrate on the correlation among the concepts of "social science," "social knowledge" and "social consciousness." The fact that such concepts are largely identical is unquestionable. However, this does not exclude differences among them. The idea of distinguishing among the various types of social knowledge occasionally assumes an aspect which "could be interpreted as an effort to pit some against others" (p 212).

Consequently, it should be a question of differences within the similarity, the essence of which is that all forms of social knowledge, study and awareness are a reflection of reality and that they can be separated only within the limits determined by the incomplete similarity between the logical and the sensory, the rational and the emotional, the direct and the indirect, the ordinary and the scientific reflection and its process and results. In particular, the concept of "knowledge" emphasizes the aspect of progress from ignorance to knowledge; the concept of "awareness" is the result of this progress. However, in neither case does an emphasis on one exclude the other. In any form of reflection, ideals and values which express and embody the class interest play a greater or lesser role. To one extent or another that similarity, defined, in turn, by the extent of consistency between said interest and objective historical laws, reflects reality. However, this fact does not provide any reason even for comparing (not to mention contraposing) the "sociohumanitarian," the value and the "sociological" to the natural scientific types of knowledge. In ideals and values knowledge is only a means of asserting the class interests; in its scientific reflection it is the main and only objective. The differences between these two types of reflection as types of knowledge, i.e., differences within the framework of similarity, may exist only when the class ideal expresses the objective trend of social development and real historical prospects, i.e., when it is applicable to Marxist-Leninist social science. Therefore, efforts to separate the "social sciences" from the "humanities" could make sense not in connection with the types of knowledge but targets. The difference between these sciences "does not consist in the least of the fact that the former study laws while the others are unique phenomena" but the fact that "they study different phenomena--study society and the individual. A science such as medicine, for example, is a humanitarian science, for its subject is man. However, could one claim that medicine does not study or formulate laws governing the development of human organism?" (pp 213-214).

Knowledge is only a variety of reflection and by opposing the postulating of "value knowledge" we cannot ignore the concept of the value reflection of reality which exists and develops in forms such as political, moral, legal, ecological and aesthetic awareness, as ordinary law and as religion in the presocialist history of humankind. Consequently, historical materialism is the most generalized form not only of the reflection of sociohistorical reality as such (in a number of works V. I. Lenin describes such reflection as "social knowledge") but also a scientific knowledge of this reality as well as



an inseparable component of Marxist-Leninist philosophy and dialectical materialism.

The fact that these terms are considered interchangeable or differentiating to one extent or another in both classical and modern works does not mean a concession to terminological voluntarism: given the common meaning of such concepts, the emphasis required by the context could be different. Furthermore, such difference may trigger the temptation to engage in terminological reform by excluding, for example, the term historical materialism from our philosophy. However, the essence and meaning of this term consist not in the fact that dialectics is inherent only in the philosophical knowledge of nature and the mind while historicism is inherent in society and social knowledge, but the fact that dialectics and historicism are two aspects of a single and most important quality of Marxist materialism. In other words, regardless of the subject of knowledge such materialism is always both dialectical and historical and always requires a dialectical and specific historical approach to the analysis and evaluation of studied phenomena. It always proceeds from the objective unity between the historical and the logical. At the same time--this is already another matter--the definition "historical" means a dialectical materialistic understanding of the history of society and its activities. However, differences between the laws of social development and functioning are also largely relative, for development means a change in the very function and conditions of their implementation, and their functioning is a prerequisite and form of development.

The dialectics and logic of historical materialism are those of all Marxist-Leninist philosophy. They are embodied most fully and comprehensively in the category of the socioeconomic system, which is a kind of social organism and a separate qualitative stage in the historical development of society (see p 82).

Both the specific historical process and social activities conducted under different historical and natural conditions are a dialectical unity of the general, the specific and the individual, nature and phenomena, causes and consequences, contents, structures and forms. In turn, sociohistorical development is manifested in the interaction between the aspects of social activities reflected in these and other categories and accomplished thanks to the type of interaction which is always created and surmounted by contradictions. In some philosophical works such aspects of the sociohistorical process and social activities may have become somewhat "effaced" or pushed into the background by the explanation of purely structural relations between "formation elements." However, historical materialism, i.e., the dialectical-materialistic theory of social development, bears no responsibility whatsoever for this fact. L. F. Il'ichev's work confirms once again this conclusion, proving the great possibilities of the dialectical analysis of social life provided by historical materialism and, unfortunately, not always used in training and propaganda publications.

We do not wish in the least to discuss individual authors, for we are facing a phenomenon which must be surmounted primarily not by criticizing specific books or excerpts but by eliminating the reasons which favor it, first among

which is the lack of the necessary strictness and self-control in the interpretation of problems already resolved by Marxism. For example, a textbook on historical materialism includes as part of material social relations, without stipulations, the socioclass structure of society; another no less prestigious publication interprets production relations once again without providing a necessary clarification as being relations among classes; in yet another textbook, in addition to material and ideological social relations (as found in Lenin) another sort of "third force" appears in relations considered "social" in the narrow meaning of the term. The social scientists must pay even greater attention to the recommendations found in the report by Comrade K. U. Chernenko at the July 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum: "Despite their full significance, discussions on the laws and categories of science should not be of a self-seeking scholastic nature." This was said on the subject of discussions of specific scientific value. How then do we assess debates which are conducted only for the sake of "dissertation" and group interest? Yet entire scientific conferences and symposia are held for the purpose of such "discussions," funds are procured for lengthy trips and paper and printing presses are procured for the publication of "theses" and "critical" articles and their refutation, the more so since the method of substantiation with the help of quotes enables us to resort to authorities and assume a number of positions. Why is it, for example, that in so-called culture studies we find dozens of definitions of culture, which continue to swell like an avalanche? One of the likely reasons is that it is by far easier to develop a new speculative structure than to make a thorough study of a specific phenomenon and to sum up the results of the study, the more so since the study of real life is occasionally hindered by the very results of speculativeness, creating a universal disparity in definitions and approaches to the problem. That is why, in my view, the weighed and examined definitions characteristic of L. F. Il'ichev's monograph will substantially help to upgrade the reliability of empirical studies, the quality of sociological programs and the accuracy of indicators.

In my view, it is particularly important that this book takes us out of the fog of discussions on the nature of the social aspects, clearly stipulating that "the set of nonmaterial-political (i.e., above all class-oriented--the reviewer), juridical and other--relations acts in the nature of secondary and superstructural relations," that "one of the basic essential and qualitatively differentiated differences between material and ideological social relations is that material relations develop irrespective of the human consciousness while ideological relations, before becoming such, undergo the stage at which people become aware of them as social relations" (pp 111-112).

Material existence (existence outside the consciousness) does not mean unconsciousness in the least. It is a different matter when a person, aware of his actions within the range of their direct objectives and results, does not as a rule anticipate or take into consideration the social content and the meaning and significance of such actions and their economic and sociopolitical consequences and that the dynamics of the multiplicity of subjective motives, aspirations and interests, determined, in the final account, by the material needs of the people, develop, as a result, into an objective logic of events, objective "in the sense that social life is independent of the social

consciousness of the people" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 18, p 345).

Why has it been necessary to refine the meaning of the term "objective"? Above all because unlike the material factor, which is an eternal and infinite substance which appears in a variety of forms, including the social form, which is always primary in terms of consciousness, the objective factor may also be identical to the material (as in Lenin's citation) as well as different from it, for the very concept of objectivity is determined through the concept of the subject and means existence outside and independently of a given specific (starting with individual) consciousness. In other words, the category of the objective is more conventional and relative and entirely depends on whose consciousness is taken as the starting point.

The concept of the objective and the subjective are comparable to the categories of the real and the potential. Thus, on the "designing" level, the internal motivation of an action, the choice of alternatives and the comparison between individual interests and social norms--unless all of this is done not for the sake of impressing others but for one's own--morality is found in a subjective and potential state. However, after the completion of the action, the moral consciousness of the subject becomes objectivized and an element of reality within which other individuals act and must take it into consideration. Is this object (which exists outside the consciousness of other people and can become a subject of their feelings and perceptions) consistent with material objects?

In all likelihood, no.

Therefore, it is not reality but the material nature of the process which is a decisive criterion which separates the social life from consciousness, material social relations from ideological relations and material from spiritual activities, for objective reality can also exist in the form of ideas, feelings and moods. The class struggle is real and objective. However, this does not turn it entirely into a phenomenon of the material life of society, for the activities of the class which has become a political force, i.e., which has turned from a "class within itself," aware of its class interests and creating its own ideology and political organizations, is defined by this ideology and becomes an organized activity. Briefly stated, the class struggle realizes and objectivizes class and political relations as a variety of ideological relations.

Despite its tremendous significance, politics may be considered a material force only in the sense invested in the familiar metaphorical expression that ideas become a material force when they conquer the masses. It is even less in the spirit of historical materialism to claim that in addition to material and ideological relations we could put alongside them some kind of "intermediary" "material-ideological" or "objective-subjective" relations.

Social life is complex and contradictory and had the task of dialectical materialism been reduced merely to the classification of social phenomena by type and subtype, one could submit a far greater number of hyphenated definitions. The point, however, is that the dialectical analysis of social



life presumes a somewhat different objective: the determination of the live, varied and conflicting entity and the study of the parts, aspects and levels interacting within it and the "mechanism" itself of this interaction which is actually the purpose of the existence of philosophical categories which, included in the methodological arsenal of historical materialism, could change to a certain extent and concretize their content in accordance with the characteristics of the object of our study. All such categories proceed from the concept of the socioeconomic system as a reflection of society in its dialectical integrity and are "restored" and included in this concept. That is why the Marxist-Leninist theory of systems and history as an ascending movement of humankind accomplished through the change of systems is a kind of quintessence of dialectics of social development.

This dialectics is more "visible" and richer than the dialectics of nature for, on the one hand, development with its conflicting and spasmodic interchanges between possibility and reality and cause and consequence appears somehow condensed here in terms of time and may be easily "tapped" and codified by nature and, on the other, in addition to the dialectical laws which operate in nature, society and its history are a form of action of the dialectics of objective and subjective factors, spontaneous and conscious features, and people's masses and outstanding individuals. Along with such categories which do not have general philosophical analogues, historical materialism uses practically all general philosophical categories, many of which on a far broader and comprehensive way compared to the study of natural processes. All of this is required by the specifics of the object of research, its extreme complexity, variability, multivariance in the manifestation of the same essential features, practically unlimited forms, types and ways of determining actions and consequences from which, in the final account, objective sociohistorical trends are formed. That is why, more than ever before society is clearly aware of the fact that the knowledge contained in dialectical categories, including the concept of socioeconomic system and its specific historical types, cannot replace in the least the results of the study of the actual sociohistorical process, or the fact that, in reflecting objective dialectics and, consequently, the objective logic of history and the activities of society at one stage or another in its development, the system of such categories provides merely the necessary methodological bridgehead for research. It gives scientific research an accurate direction and offers the possibility, along with induction, of making extensive use of deductive means of analysis and summation of the information available to the scientist and the proofs of hypotheses and conclusions he suggests.

The features of the identification of the knowledge contained in the category of "sociohistorical system" with sociohistorical reality itself were manifested, in particular, in the suggestions of some authors to abandon the use of the concept of "society" in the Marxist-Leninist social science and replace it with the concept of "system." Such concepts, however, are essentially not interchangeable, for the former reflect above all a qualitative definition of human activities and human relations compared to nature and the nature of interconnections between the social entity and its parts, whereas the latter pertains to the structure and the dynamics of this entity and the correlation between the quantitative and qualitative aspects of

sociohistorical development, social life and consciousness. In its various interpretations the former is used by philosophers and sociologists of all trends whereas the second expresses exclusively a dialectical-materialistic understanding of society itself, social activity and human history. Furthermore, if we identify the concept of society with that of system, how should we term the transitional (from one system to another) types of social structures and relations? The main feature in making synonymous the term "society" with the category "system" would be a multivariant one (including the fact that said term would be applicable also to relatively small and voluntary associations) but would lose the scientific strictness, inner logic and dialectical potential it possesses.

It is this potential that L. F. Il'ichev uses in his analysis of the debate on the so-called "Asian production method," and in the study of the interconnection between economics and the state-legal superstructure, the role of the latter in regulating socialist production relations in particular, and in his criticism of "technological determinism" and other bourgeois sociological theories which are currently pitted against historical materialism. However, the sharpness of a scientific outlook is defined not only by the depth and quality of resolving problems already raised by science but also by detecting new problems which demand the attention of the scientist, for the objective logic of historical materialism, on which its categories rest, a logic to which L. F. Il'ichev reacts perfectly, is inherent not only in that science but in its development process as well. One such problem is the creation of theoretical models of systems, i.e., further progress in the study of typical forms of manifestation of their nature and historical specifics.

These nature and specifics are manifested most fully in the nature of contradictions and their correlation and means of resolution. We should distinguish, on the one hand, between contradictions organically inherent in a system and, on the other, those created by subjective factors (such as various levels of inappropriate management decisions).

Since a system is a series of levels of social relations and corresponding activities, the system of contradictions may be structured on the basis of the determination of superstructural by basic factors, reflections in the mind, ideological relations and types of activity and contradictions in social life and the production method. Since the system is not a static but a dynamic structure, it inevitably includes the contradictions among levels on which human contacts and activities take place. Since such activities are a mandatory prerequisite for the effect of objective laws and, consequently, for the manifestation and surmounting of objective contradictions, a decisive importance in the development of a class-oriented society is assumed by political relations which determine the deployment of class forces and their interest in resolving class contradictions and ability to perform corresponding actions. This is one of the principal manifestations of the primacy of politics over economics and the relative autonomy and activeness of the superstructure in terms of the base.

The study of contradictions within a system defined by a theoretical model enables us to analyze each system as the dialectical unity of the general, the

specific and the individual and to study the features of their manifestation on any one of these levels, for contradictions in the economic foundation of society, manifested in interclass and, even more so, interethnic and intergroup relations, could become stronger or weaker and assume characteristic forms of manifestation under the influence of features typical of each one of these areas and the specific political and cultural situations developing within them.

However, not only the study of contradictions for their own sake, so to speak, but also the determination of the role of each of the units within their system in the development of socialist society is the main practical interest. In this case, in resolving this problem as well, a theoretical model could prove to be quite useful. It should become, above all, a model of "self-dynamics" of production forces, and help to determine its natural historical character. The dialectics of production and need is the very foundation of this process. As Marx proved, production not only serves consumption but is also a consumption process itself for materials, raw materials and manpower. Unlike such production and general social requirements, individual needs are a complex and contradictory unity between natural and cultural elements. Both general social and individual needs show a trend toward systematic growth determined, above all, by the increased size of the population. However, the production process which follows such growth or, sometimes, even outstrips it, does not stop ahead of requirements, for the latter increase even further under the influence of changes in mentality and culture. Such changes, which run through and transform natural needs, greatly increase the volume of production outlays required for their satisfaction and, consequently, the possibility of contradictions arising between needs and production.

Some such contradictions are surmounted by improving distribution relations and increasing the moral and aesthetic regulators of need, such as taste and measure. However, they find their radical solution in the development of production forces and the growth of labor productivity.

It follows from Marx's definition of "simple aspects of the labor process" (expedient activity or labor itself, labor objective and labor means) that labor could be considered as the functioning of the production forces of society in which manpower is the "expedient activity." Manpower cannot be reduced to a simple totality of producers but is in all cases a production collective with a clear division of labor and functions among individuals and groups and an administrative and a management system. Therefore, it could be said that production relations (as we know, the division of labor and the organizational structure of the production process are some of their aspects) are in terms of production forces not only the external social wrapping or a kind of superstructure within the production framework but an element of their own inner nature. They literally run through production forces in the same way that their other aspect--the form of ownership--runs through the areas of class relations and politics.

Being as a whole a material and objective phenomenon, the labor force contains within itself a subjective element, like any human force. This element, which operates in individual work as the personal professional experience of the worker and his ability and mood, is expanded in the course of social and group



labor by collective professional skills and a psychological "climate" of the group and a professional-psychological ability to ensure the optimal solution of production problems. Hence the increasing influence which production exerts not only on the natural and technical but the humanitarian sciences as well, sociology, psychology, ethics, aesthetics and education in particular.

As one of the main prerequisites for the successful functioning of the labor force under socialism, true socialist collectivism is a manifestation of production relations of reciprocal aid and cooperation among people free from exploitation. This manifestation, however, is not an inevitable automatic act. In order to close the circle efforts must be made to turn a potential into reality and to organize and control the most complex psychological mechanism with the help of which numerous human wills and actions are converted into a single main production social force. It follows from this that the problem of improving production management has not only a strictly organizational but a sociopsychological aspect as well and its solution starts within the primary cell of the huge and complex economic organism--the production collective.

The contradiction between the level of production and the needs of society, which is resolved in the process of labor intensification, operates within the framework of the production process as a contradiction between the basic aspects of the labor process, i.e., as the need to produce a maximum of material goods with a minimal outlay of limited (socially and individually) physical and intellectual manpower and, consequently, the efficient elimination of spontaneously arising disparities between labor tools and objects and possibilities used in the production of technical facilities and the ability of the worker to utilize these possibilities, i.e., his skill, mastery and ability.

The solution of these contradictions becomes faster and more painlessly the more production relations are consistent with production forces and the socioadministrative structure of society is consistent with production relations. Consequently, the entire importance of socialist production relations as an "essential determination" of a given socioeconomic system (see p 92) may be identified and understood only on the basis of the study of its role in determining not only the nature of contradictions but also the means of and efficiency in surmounting them.

Therefore, the idea of theoretical modeling in the study of a socioeconomic system promises substantially to enrich the results of the study of its individual aspects and components until their dialectical interaction, frequently separated from a system, become a convincing proof of the fundamental conclusion that "in order to provide a suitable solution to the problem of the structure of a system, the most promising is the system-structural approach developed by Marxism-Leninism on the basis of dialectics, the methodological potential of which has still not been sufficiently realized, although some efforts in this respect have been made" (p 88).

In connection with the increased demands facing the social sciences and the intensification of their practical returns, greater attention has been paid in recent years to efforts to find additional possibilities in this area. One of

them could be increasing the purposefulness of scientific research and refining specific assignments and, therefore, the structure of the individual sciences. Most of the discussions today are on the correlation among historical materialism, scientific communism and sociology. Proceeding from the fact that historical materialism is a reflection of the dialectics of social life, systems and logic and, consequently, the substantiation of efficient structuring criteria and defining continuity and, in this case, defining the fundamental traditions of Marxist-Leninist philosophy become some of the main requirements governing its structure. Therefore, the structure of historical materialism must mandatorily include problems of the dialectics of social life and consciousness, the dialectics of the general and the specific, the dialectics of sociohistorical development and, finally, the dialectics of social knowledge. It is only by critically revising some occasionally purely random standards in defining the problems of a given science that we can raise the question of its correlation with other areas in the social sciences.

At that same time, defining the object and, respectively, the limits of a science could be hardly likened to charting a map (like a geographic map), and the demarcation of borders with only the sinking of border posts required. What are the "scientific junctions?" Are they not a kind of "common territory" of related sciences, developed through different methods and in different theoretical aspects?

As we pointed out, historical materialism is a science of the most general laws of social activities and development. The "communist socioeconomic system" is the subject of scientific communism (p 192). At the same time, however, we find in the center of attention of this science "matters such as the historical mission of the working class and the role of its political parties, the need for the ways of a socialist revolution, principles of reorganization of society and the fate of the global revolutionary process, rather than merely problems dealing with the basic features of the communist socioeconomic system" (ibid.). Finally, "as a science, sociology studies two types of processes. The first are purely social phenomena, such as the individual, the collective, the family, etc... The second are social relations which develop in connection with the functioning of all other social relations, such as economic, political and ideological" (p 199). Each of these definitions reflects accurately and logically and, above all, essentially adequately the trend of scientific research in the respective areas. Why only essentially? Because the studies are conducted by specific scientists or, in other words, their subject is scientific individuality and interest and, consequently, a creative activeness which is hardly always considered even when we draw arbitrary dividing lines among sciences. Many are noted researchers who could be named, starting with Marx, who found themselves squeezed within the limits of "their own" subject (and, respectively, scientific genre) and who combined within a single work not only different levels but different areas of knowledge! Naturally, this is no reason to abandon efforts to demarcate areas of interest among different sciences. The question is how to accomplish this.

The fact that the subjects of historical materialism, scientific communism and Marxist sociology coincide in many respects and that a visual depiction of

their relative location could be better represented by a model of intersecting rather than contiguous circles can be seen from the definitions we cited.

Nevertheless, differences, some of them quite substantial, do exist among these sciences. To begin with, the existence of relatively vast areas of common interests does not mean that their subject is identical. Secondly, even within these areas each science has its specific emphases, approaches, study methods and means for including the results of such studies within a scientific theory. Thirdly, in shifting from one level of knowledge to another, each individual science follows its specific way. We are familiar with the interpretation of historical materialism as an extension of the concepts of dialectical materialism in the study of social phenomena. This interpretation has its reason. Indeed, in historical materialism deductive knowledge plays a very substantial role. In sociology, the researcher rises to a philosophical level primarily through induction. Consequently, a science is considered not simply as a frozen structure but a process, the content and forms of which, even with a relative similarity of subjects, will differ among the individual sciences to the point that, for example, the sociologist will inevitably proceed from historical materialism as a research methodology but hardly always (as confirmed by research practice) rise to a philosophical level in his summations. Furthermore, the very structure of this level which, in the final account, reflects the specific object of sociology, obviously (this becomes clear on the higher, the mature stage in the development of sociology) still does not entirely coincide with the structure of historical materialism as a structural component of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. It seems to me, therefore, that it would be preferable to distinguish, on the one hand, between the higher philosophical level of sociological knowledge and, on the other, historical materialism as an integral philosophical theory and to reinforce this distinction terminologically as well.

Although different in terms of subject and structure, all social sciences under socialist conditions come closer to each other as areas of the methodologically and humanistically single trend of knowledge, closely related to the practice of building socialism. "Any area of human knowledge loses its meaning and rights to life if it is not practically aimed at the person and is pursued in the interests of the person" (p 240). This sharp formulation of the problem of "science and man" and "science and the fate of humankind" is particularly justified today, for "imperialist reaction, the U.S. leadership in particular, as it formulates delirious plans for world domination, as was pointed out at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, is pushing humankind to the brink of nuclear catastrophe through its aggressive policy"; in this light the problem of the trueness of science and its right to command the respect of the people, as well as the very need for science become dependent on who they serve and for what purpose or, in other words, become mainly problems of political morality.

Therefore, the increased international tension and the ideological struggle in the center of which stands the very existence of humankind, have triggered new approaches in scientific research and new criteria in its assessment. In the imperialist countries priority is assumed by the clash between the traditionally humanistic nature of science and its use for purposes of nuclear blackmail of humankind. In the socialist society the relevant question is



that of upgrading the efficiency of science (social science in particular) in the assertion and development of socialism as the main force which can prevent a nuclear catastrophe, in perfecting the socialist way of life and in proving that socialism alone can resolve the most difficult problems of social development.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## AID TO SOCIOLOGISTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 117-119

[Review by Academician M. Mitin of the book "Rabochaya Kniga Sotsiologa" [The Sociologist's Work Book]. Second revised and enlarged edition. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 477 pp]

[Text] The June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, along with the just criticism of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research, pointed out the need out to upgrade the role of sociology in the specific study of social phenomena and the organization of educational activities and definition of their efficiency. The most important prerequisite for increasing practical returns from sociology is the profound development of its theoretical and methodological problems and the enrichment of the research methodical arsenal.

The book under review, the second edition of which was published by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research, is a useful aid in resolving such problems by scientists and practical workers. As a comprehensive work and a kind of "calling card" of contemporary Soviet sociology, this book is an introduction to all parts of sociological science. It helps to train sociology generalists who can organize and conduct empirical sociological theories, the main sectors of sociological knowledge and the principal methods of sociological analysis.

Prime attention has been paid in the work to the methodological aspect of research, for which reason it helps to resolve the problem formulated at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum of upgrading the methodological mental discipline of our social sciences. The authors proceed from the accurate premise that Marxist-Leninist sociology is, on the one hand, a theoretical science discipline, within which fundamental problems related to the specifics of the social mechanisms of action of the laws governing social development are brought to light and the conclusions and concepts relative to various social commonalities are substantiated. On the other hand, this is an applied discipline with its specific methods for gathering, processing and summing up sociological data, the significance of which in management activities on the different levels of Soviet society and in strengthening the scientific foundations of party work is increasing steadily. All of this put together

enables us to approach more substantiatedly the study of the specific manifestations of social laws at different stages in building socialism, the timely identification of problems requiring urgent solutions and the penetration into the core of occurring social processes and arising contradictions as well as to undertake the formulation of reliable social forecasts and practical recommendations.

The difficulty of writing a book on such complex problems is unquestionable. This is because such a work must be contemporary and quite comprehensive in terms of scientific topics yet specialized. Furthermore, it must also be accessible to a broad range of people involved in socioeconomic planning and decision making in the area of social practice. That is why it was written by a large number of leading scientists in the country. The authors have tried to present in a simple and accessible style complex theoretical and methodological problems, many of which are still unresolved because of the steady development of theoretical and applied sociology.

The second edition of this work has been revised in accordance with the latest results obtained by highly skilled specialists. The chapters on the subject and structure of sociological science have been virtually rewritten and those on the various areas of sociological knowledge, the organization and conduct of empirical studies, selection, measurements and surveys have been reedited and expanded. The structure of the presentation of the data has been developed more thoroughly, enabling the reader to become better oriented in the book's content and to locate topics of interest. Each chapter provides a bibliography for additional reading. A brief glossary of basic sociological terms, a topic index and an index of symbols have been added. Some of the examples and illustrations are new.

The book consists of four parts. The first deals with general theoretical-methodological problems, while the others present the individual research methods. Understandably, the subject and structure of sociological knowledge are discussed extensively.

The work considers the theoretical-methodological foundations of Marxist-Leninist sociology and defines the subjects of general and separate sociological theories and individual sectors of sociological knowledge.

In discussing problems of social planning and the elaboration of a system of social indicators, the authors point out that social planning is a qualitatively new stage in national economic planning, characteristic of developed socialism. Taking into consideration the sociostatistical information on the forms of manifestation and mechanism of action of socialist laws, it enables us to determine with scientific accuracy the possible social efficiency of proposed economic, organizational and other measures (see p 104). Unquestionably, this section will be of interest not only to sociological specialists but to party and economic managers directly involved in the formulation and implementation of social development plans.

The authors ascribe great importance to the elaboration of a conceptual research apparatus, the formulation of its program and the ability to define its topic and subject, targets and tasks, to formulate problems and hypotheses



and to implement procedures of interpretation and enactment of concepts. They emphasize that the effectiveness of sociological research greatly depends on the scientific standard of the development of its program. In the opposite case, it would lead to unconvincing theoretical conclusions and ineffective practical recommendations (see p 112).

The book includes extensively illustrated examples of a detailed description of general scientific methods (mathematics and statistics) using sociology, as well as strictly sociological methods (surveys, sociometric methods, etc.). Some logical and methodical procedures through which such methods are applied in sociological research are considered. The work ends with a description of the rules for drafting reports on the results of studies and their practical application.

The thorough interpretation of the methods for gathering, processing and analyzing sociological data provided by the authors, and the presence of a large number of tables (including those required for computing statistical figures), graphs, charts, examples of computation of social characteristics and practical recommendations enable the reader to obtain a sufficiently full idea of the set of methodical instruments used in contemporary sociological research and to master the skill of their practical utilization. This is particularly topical today in connection with the organization of systems for training cadres of skilled sociologists and the introduction of the "applied sociology" subject in a number of higher educational institutions in the country.

Let us note in conclusion that despite individual omissions (for example, there is no presentation of the sociology of culture and the sociology of management; problems of the secondary data analysis, information support of sociological research, and others are not considered), unquestionably, as a whole this work is a good theoretical-methodological and methodical aid for ideological workers, applied sociologists and all social scientists who use empirical research methods in their work. So far this is the only major training aid in sociology and the extensive and painstaking work done by authors to improve it deserves full support.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## STRANGE POSITION

AU220815 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 1984 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 119-126

[Article by Ye. Bugayev, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] The journal VOPROSY ISTORII (1984 No 4) published an article by Ye. A. Ambartsumov, candidate of historical sciences, entitled "V. I. Lenin's Analysis of the Causes of the 1921 Crisis and of the Ways of Resolving it." Judging by the article headline, the author's intention was to show readers the progress of Lenin's thinking oriented to the study and explanation of one of the most complicated sociopolitical situations during the formative period of the Soviet socialist society, the situation that preceded the adoption of important decisions.

However, as the article shows, Ye. A. Ambartsumov is mainly interested in the announced topic only inasmuch as he has decided to reflect--by proceeding from this topic--upon the causes of crises *IN SOCIALISM* and the ways out of these crises (see p 16, my own italics--Ye. B.).

Well, the examination of this question and the research method aimed at grasping the essence of V. I. Lenin's methodological approach to the analysis of a concrete historical phenomenon to examine other social phenomena in a similar way can only be welcomed. Naturally, under the condition that the researcher demonstrates the necessary scientific strictness.

In this particular case, matters regrettably stand differently.

The author sees in both the 1921 crisis and Lenin's explanation of it mainly what he has decided to see. And that is precisely a crisis of the authority emanating from its mistakes and, at times, from its deliberate actions that are contrary to the interests of the working masses. This, then, becomes his key to explaining the crises in socialism in general. The author shows scant interest in the objective conditions and contradictions. It is no accident that he regards all contradictions as being of the same order as political mistakes; that is, more precisely, as emanating from these mistakes. As a result, the objective and subjective factors become confused and the latter are moved into the primary position.

All other methodological errors and errors regarding facts follow from this. The concrete historical approach to considering various collisions sociopolitical in their origins and nature and that have taken place in some socialist countries is slurred over; terms are substituted for one another (for instance, the "transitional period" and "socialism" are equated) and political emphases are confused.

Ye. A. Ambartsumov displays a lack of attention that is hard to explain toward some of the most important lessons of the revolutionary struggle. One of these lessons is that, having been defeated in their own country, the capitalists and landowners of that country count on the assistance of international capital and the exploitative classes in power in other states. It is sufficient to recall the intervention in Soviet Russia and the 1918-19 intervention in Western Europe. The antisocialist actions in Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and in Poland in 1980-81 invariably enjoyed not only the moral, but also the material support of imperialism.

In the country where the revolution has triumphed, the exploitative classes continue to own the resources and retain the bonds with and influence over a considerable section of small property owners and intelligentsia for a long time. The hope for restoration is constantly present in their minds and they try to fulfill this hope at any opportune moment. It is solely in this sense that the counterrevolutionary actions represent an "internal affair" of every individual country concerned.

However, in the era of antagonism between the two systems, there are clearly only a few counterrevolutionary potentials that can be called "one's own" or "internal." Any antisocialist action wherever it may occur immediately wins the technical, financial and political support of imperialist circles. This is not merely an "incitement," as the article's author terms the direct assistance to the counterrevolutions: it is a direct interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states.

It is astonishing that Ye. A. Ambartsumov has not been able to perceive anywhere in the crisis periods the role of the right-wing opportunist elements who, like Nagy in Hungary and Dubcek, Cernik and Sik in Czechoslovakia, were virtually preparing a counterrevolution.

The reactionary and counterrevolutionary forces in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland were formed and grouped together under the patronage of the right-wing and revisionist elements assisted by the imperialists. Their composition and tactics were different but they had one and the same goal: to weaken the communist party and the centralized planned economic management, grant freedom to private entrepreneurship and then the rest would follow by itself.

The documents of the MSZMP, CPCz and PzPR central committees provide a principled analysis not only of individual errors or political miscalculations, but of the objective conditions in each of these countries and outside; that is, the conditions the combination of which led to the crisis phenomena in the Hungarian People's Republic, which had only just entered the stage of early socialism, in the CSSR, which had only just



completed the basic socialist transformation and the PPR, which was still passing through the transitional period between capitalism and socialism.

Ambartsumov considers all these stages of development, beginning with the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat entirely as "finished" socialism and transfers to it the antagonistic contradictions which, in reality, are characteristic of the transitional period between capitalism and socialism.

The transitional period, lasting until the complete victory and consolidation of socialism, is filled with the struggle of the "victorious proletariat that has taken power in its own hands against the defeated bourgeoisie which, however, has not been destroyed, has not disappeared, has not ceased to resist and has intensified its resistance" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 38, p 377). This then is the class historical basis for appraising the essence of the 1921 crisis (Kronshtadt mutiny) as well as, for example, the essence of the events in Poland in 1980 and 1981. However, their resemblance ends there, for the motives for the antisocialist actions have been dissimilar in different countries and their sociopolitical background was also distinctive in each individual case. It must be noted in this connection that the bourgeois and antisocialist elements know how to learn from their defeats and have taken their miscalculations in one country into account in order not to repeat them in another country; this is, they do not act according to one and the same scenario.

The unity and struggle of the opposites are the motive force and source of every development. Contradictions have an objective character and it is impermissible from the materialist dialectic viewpoint to rank them in the same order with mistakes; that is, with the result of incorrect appraisals of an objective situation at a given time and under strictly defined conditions and, consequently, also with the incorrect actions resulting from these appraisals.

Mistakes can be avoided and contradictions cannot be abolished until something new emerges from their unity and struggle, something new with the new opposites and the new unity. Mistakes can and must be revealed and corrected. Contradictions must be analyzed, the trend of their objective development understood and a course promoted that will ensure that the emerging new and progressive will receive support and not be slowed down in its struggle against what is conservative and what is becoming obsolete.

Listing certain complications of the situation in the individual socialist countries, the author approves that Soviet sociologists have begun "lately to broach these questions in analyzing, for instance, the problem of contradictions in socialism" (in this connection reference is made to an article by A. P. Butenko in the journal NOVOYE VREMYA, 1982, No 6) and further says: "The Marxist thesis that the socialist society is developing through the struggle and overcoming of contradictions is now attracting increasingly greater attention" (p 16). This statement appears to have been made as though the law of the unity and struggle of opposites had not been recognized as the core of the materialist dialectic many decades ago (the Marxist-Leninists were always guided by it in their examination of any phenomenon or process in

nature of social life) and as though well-grounded and definite statements about that had not been made at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

Discussing the methods of solving the sociopolitical crisis that occurred in Soviet Russia in 1921, the apogee of which was the Kronshtadt mutiny, the author by no means sees the main source of the crisis in the social class relations, including the antagonist social class relations, at the beginning of the transitional period. In his opinion, Lenin "perceived the fundamental cause of the crisis precisely in the unsuitability of the old methods, in the former concept of development and in the inability to quickly reorganize an application to the new situation" (19).

Here the entire attention in general is concentrated on the subjective errors of the leadership of the proletarian state and on the contradictions between the leaders and the led. The class contradictions within the country and on the international scene move somewhere to the background as factors that are hardly essential or completely unessential.

What then were the "contradictions and errors" that engendered a "crisis in socialism" in the young Soviet republic?

The republic was only just emerging from the civil war that had been imposed on it and during which the imperialists, who were unable to win, took care to bring it great misfortunes and destruction in order to prevent the new system from immediately demonstrating its advantages.

Immediately following the imperialist war, the 3-year civil war completely ruined the country and threw its economy back many decades. In 1920, the country produced 8.7 million metric tons of coal and smelted 116,000 metric tons of pig iron. In 1921, the gross output of the large (registered) industry amounted to 21 percent of its prewar volume and, in the same year, the gross output of agriculture amounted to 60 percent and that of the railway freight transport to 22 percent of the respective prewar volumes.

All these troubles were further augmented by the terribly poor harvest in 1920. The country managed to procure only 100 million poods of grain whereas the very minimum demand was for 400 million poods. In the spring of 1921, the norms of agricultural product distribution were again sharply reduced in Moscow, Petrograd and their industrial centers. Grain was available in some regions but no fuel and transport were available to deliver it to those who were hungry. "Russia emerged from the war in a position," Lenin said, "in which its state more than anything else resembled the state of a man who had been beaten up half dead and now here, God help him, is raising himself on crutches! This, you see, is the situation in which we find ourselves" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 42, p 68).

There was yet another difficult circumstance: the war, hunger and economic devastation were forcing workers to give up factory work, settle in villages and cease being workers (ibid., p 42), and many of them turned to handicrafts or became "peddlers." The best worker cadres were dying on the front and the others lost themselves among the people to escape the mobilization. All this weakened the revolution's social basis.

The disastrous situation in the countryside represented an enormous economic and political weight for the republic, which had only just emerged from war. Having received land from the hands of the new authority, the mass of the peasantry supported the workers class during the civil war and fed the Red Army, receiving virtually nothing in exchange, and overstrained itself as a result of the poor 1920 harvest. This situation intensified the wavering of peasants as small property owners in the direction of the bourgeoisie and, in combination with the army demobilization, led, as Lenin put it, to something between war and peace. "It is precisely demobilization and the end of the civil war that make it impossible to concentrate all of one's tasks on peaceful construction because demobilization engenders a continuation of the war in a new form. When tens and hundreds of thousands of demobilized men cannot join in work, when they are returning impoverished and ruined and, having become accustomed to war, they very nearly regard war as the only handicraft, then we find ourselves drawn into a new form of war, a new aspect of it that can be singularly expressed in one word: banditry" (ibid., p 10). It is precisely this fundamental circumstance that "determined," as Lenin said, "a whole series of errors and intensified the crisis" (ibid.) which Ye. A. Ambartsumov completely disregards when he superimposes Lenin's analysis of the 1921 events on completely different phenomena that took place under totally different socioeconomic and foreign political conditions.

Following the end of the Polish-Soviet war and the liquidation of Wrangel in the Ukraine and Crimea, the kulak bands formed by the socialist revolutionaries and remnants of Kolchak's and Denikin's armies which had gone underground, numbered tens of thousands of men in the Central Chernozem gubernias, northern Caucasus and Siberia.

It was on 28 February 1921 that, having been organized by the internal and external counterrevolutionary forces, the Kornshadt mutiny broke out (the Paris press let the secret out and reported its "beginning" 2 weeks earlier!). "The petit bourgeois counterrevolution," Lenin said, "is undoubtedly more dangerous than Denikan, Yudenich and Kolchak put together because what is involved for us in this connection is a country where the proletariat is in the minority, a country where devastation affected the peasant property and, in addition, in which the army demobilization produced an incredible amount of rebel elements" (ibid., p 24).

These, then, are the "errors and contradictions" that led to the Kronshtadt mutiny and to the situation, as Lenin observed, in which "we stumbled into a big--I believe the biggest--internal political crisis of Soviet Russia."

"This internal crisis revealed discontent not only among a significant part of the peasantry but also among a considerable part of workers" (ibid., vol 45, p 282). One may ask: Why is the author not primarily blaming counterrevolution for the crisis and why is he virtually blaming Soviet power for it?

Yes, this was "our situation, our own environment." The author quotes these words of Lenin to anticipate his own conjectures that Lenin "clearly differentiated between the civil war...and the internal political crisis; that is, the conflict within the system, between the authority and a section of its



social basis and to end up with such pseudohistorical conclusions: "Herein is the essence of Lenin's understanding of socialism's political crisis as a contradiction that has broken out into the open and even as a conflict between the revolutionary authority and its policy on one hand and the direct interests of the working masses on the other, a conflict expressed in sharp manifestations of their discontent" (p 17).

This far-fetched scheme cannot stand up against the facts. Lenin never and nowhere separated the Kronshtadt mutiny from the civil war. In the booklet "On the Food Tax," he emphasized that all true White guards hailed the Kronshtadt mutineers and collected funds through banks to help Kronshtadt" (ibid., vol 43, p 239). Kronshtadt exhibited a turn in the White Guard tactic: not to directly overthrow Soviet power but to try to change its class character and remove it from the communist leadership. "...Let us support anyone, even the anarchists, any Soviet power as long as only the bolsheviks are overthrown, as long as only a shift of power is achieved! It makes no difference, either to the left or right, only that the power must be shifted away from the bolsheviks..." (ibid.). This is how Lenin characterized this new tactic.

Hence also the Kronshtadt mutineers' slogan that was actively supported by Milyukov, leader of the cadets: "Soviets Without Communists." Of course, the contemporary Milyukovs, Chernovs and Martovs can unite around this slogan, perhaps even with a correction: Let the communists participate in the government as a loyal opposition. However, all analogies end at that.

How could we talk about political crises in socialism which as yet existed nowhere as a complete social system? "It appears that there has never been anyone yet who, concerning himself with the question of Russia's economy, would deny the transitional nature of this economy," Lenin wrote in the booklet "On the Food Tax." "And it seems no communist has ever denied the fact that the term 'Socialist Soviet Republic' indicates the determination of the Soviet power to carry out the transition to socialism and not at all any recognition of the existing economic system as socialist" (ibid., p 206). It was only the first approach to building socialism that was being carried out when it was interrupted by the civil war. What was still ahead was a most difficult transition to peaceful construction and new forms of the alliance between the workers class and the peasantry were required. The party sought them and the question of transition from the surplus appropriation system [prodrazverstka] to the food tax system was not raised by Kronshtadt but by Lenin as early as November 1920. The 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) determined the New Economic Policy as one calculated to draw the masses of peasants into building socialism.

The New Economic Policy naturally contributed to resolving the 1921 political crisis. But in relation to what was it new? On many occasions Lenin pointed to a direct continuity between the New Economic Policy and the plan he had worked out as early as in the "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power." This continuity was already noted by Lenin at the Eighth All-Russian Congress of the Soviets on 22 December 1920 and was especially emphasized by him in the booklet "On the Food Tax." Thus, this was a continuation of the "old," the immediate post-October policy under new conditions.

Between these two periods was the stage necessitated by the civil war and the policy of "war communism" in relation to which the New Economic Policy was a new policy.

Of course, the civil war modified the conditions of transition to socialism, and this modification could not but lead to errors and failures. "Could such a new task, new on a worldwide scale, be begun without failures and errors?" Lenin asked in his article "On the Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution" (ibid., vol 44, p 150). He also wrote in the same article that the bolsheviks "have become accustomed to immensely difficult struggle. Why else would our enemies call us 'hard as stone' and representatives of 'bone-breaking policy.' But we have at least also learned this: To a certain extent we have learned another art necessary in the revolution, that of flexibility, the ability to quickly and sharply change our tactic, taking the changed objective conditions into account and choosing another road to our goal when the previous road proves to be lacking in purpose and impossible in a certain period" (ibid., p 151).

This is how it was also as regards the transition to the New Economic Policy. What had been envisaged to be accomplished in the spring of 1918 turned out to be impossible in the winter and spring of 1920-21. Lenin demonstrated with an enormous theoretical and emotional force not only the socioeconomic, internal and foreign-political difficulty, but also the unique psychological difficulty of that transition. "Moved by the wave of enthusiasm and having awakened the people's enthusiasm, first the general political and then the war enthusiasm," Lenin wrote, "we counted on immediately carrying out great (both the general calculated, or perhaps it is more true to say we proposed without any sufficient calculations, to organize--by direct orders of the proletarian state--the communist way of state production and state distribution of products in a country of small peasants. Life revealed our error. A number of transitional steps were required: state capitalism and socialism were required to prepare--to prepare with work over many years--the transition to communism" (ibid.). This, then, is Lenin's explanation of the fact that what had been planned in the spring of 1918 had to be carried out at the end of 1920 in a different way but in the same direction. And what is involved is not the "Utopian character" of Lenin's "model" of jumping over the transitional period, as Ye. A. Ambartsumov assesses "war communism" (p 18), but rather the terrible reality the name of which is the civil war and foreign intervention that pushed aside not a utopian but a thoroughly and well thought-out planned approach to the socialist construction outlined in the "Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power." If it may be appropriate to use a literary form, it is possible here, if you please, to agree with the opinions about the revolutionary romanticism of the masses, not losing sight of the realistic fact that it was a question of a period when revolutions were maturing in all of Europe and their course and outcome were unpredictable.

The essence of transition to the New Economic Policy was to advance the rural economy by any means and feed the workers, something without which it was impossible to restore industry. For this purpose it was necessary to retreat, to make concessions to peasants not for the sake of reviving capitalism and petit bourgeoisie, but for the sake of building socialism. This was a look

forward, not backward, to the small-scale commodity production toward which the petit bourgeois counterrevolution was pulling, not an acceptance of its demands, as it somehow turns out in the author's article (p 24), but a decision that placed the alliance of workers and peasants, an alliance for the sake of building socialism, on a solid economic foundation.

The transition of small owners to collective work is impossible without large industry. According to Lenin, the "material basis, technology, the use of tractors and machines on a large scale and electrification on a large scale" (ibid., vol 43, p 60) are needed for the socialist transformation of agriculture.

"The intermediate stages for a transition from a patriarchal system to socialism will be unnecessary or very nearly unnecessary" (ibid., p 228), even for backward peoples, if the electrification of the entire country is achieved. However, under these conditions, the way to electricity and tractors was made through a quick advance in the small peasant economy.

Lenin also clearly perceived the dangers inherent in the New Economic Policy, in particular that of permitting the private commodity exchange and commerce. He warned at the 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks): "Even if at the beginning the free trade is not linked with the White Guards in such a way as the Kronstadt was, it will nevertheless inevitably lead to the same White Guards attitude, to the victory of capitalism and its full restoration. And, I repeat, we must clearly perceive this political danger" (ibid., p 25). Soon thereafter he summarized this in the booklet "On the Food Tax": "The revival of the petit bourgeoisie and capitalism occurs on the basis of a certain (even if only local) freedom of trade. There is no doubt about that. It would be ridiculous to close one's eyes to this fact" (ibid., p 221). And the question was: Who, whom? Who will overtake whom: whether the proletarian state power will be able to keep the reviving capitalism in strict boundaries and use it in the interests of socialism or the new capitalists will organize themselves and jeopardize the very existence of the Soviet state. For this reason the party strictly monitored the area of commodity turnover and capitalist entrepreneurship. Lenin wrote: "...in our country, its boundaries were set (through the expropriation of landowners and the bourgeoisie in the economy and through the establishment of the worker-peasant power in politics) sufficiently narrowly and 'moderately'" (ibid., p 231).

In his report on the food tax at the 10th All-Russian Conference of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) Lenin absolutely clearly pointed out the purpose and conditions of mutual relations with the peasantry stating "from the viewpoint of the workers class, an agreement is permissible, correct and possible in principle only if it supports the dictatorship of the workers class and represents one of the measures aimed at eliminating the classes..." (ibid., pp 301-302). "We take the class correlation into account and consider how the proletariat must act to lead the peasantry--despite everything--in the direction of communism" (ibid., pp 329-330).

In light of Lenin's analysis and the factual conditions and essence of the New Economic Policy, Ye. A. Ambartsumov's assertion that "the New Economic Policy,



which was launched as an antioriais measure, grew into an optimal strategy of transition to socialism" (p 29) appears devoid of supporting arguments and incorrect, if we do not forget that, according to him, the essence of the New Economic Policy was connected with concessions to the petit bourgeois' views and attitudes (p 24).

As attested by Lenin's works and CPSU practice, the change to the new Economic Policy was not a means of overcoming the errors and contradictions of socialism or the "crisis" of socialism, as Ye. A. Ambartsumov claims, but a policy calculated at temporarily permitting free trade and the capitalist elements, within strictly defined limits and under the control of the proletarian state, to gain control over an uncontrolled petit bourgeois development which, under certain influences and conditions, can grow into a petit bourgeois-anarchist counterrevolution. This policy was designed to ensure society's progress along the path of building socialism in a small peasant, multistructured and multinational country. The first bricks were thereby laid in the new society's structure. All of this was accomplished in an extraordinarily difficult internal political and international situation.

His failure to understand the antagonisms and their distinction from the contradictions and crisis phenomena that have various causes and appear differently in different countries embarking on the socialist path lead Ye. A. Ambartsumov to the following "generalization": "Unlike the 1921 crisis in Soviet Russia, the sociopolitical crises of the 1950s and the subsequent years in the fraternal countries of socialism where, of course, the situation was different in many respects, began in cities and rarely spread to the countryside. In 1953 in the GDR, in 1956 in Hungary and Poland, in 1968 in Czechoslovakia and in 1980 in Poland, the peasantry remained neutral and did not support the counterrevolution. The latest Polish crisis also began in the city, that is, more precisely, with the workers' strike; the peasantry was by no means drawn into it immediately but only eventually when the efforts of the then PZPR leadership to overcome the crisis were indecisive and in the nature of halfway measures." And then quite an unexpected turn of events: "It is thus illogical to see the causes of this crisis in the small landowner structure of the Polish village. As is know, the full collectivization in Czechoslovakia did not prevent the 1968 crisis" (p 20).

We have here evidence of a vague understanding of the differences between the events in different countries, the events taken all at once, as well as evidence of a naive belief that the antisocialist elements always act strictly according to their current social affiliation; that is, so to speak, according to their passports. K. Marx himself noted that certainly not all representatives of bouregois democracy are "shopkeepers or admirers of shopkeepers. By their education and individual positions, they may be as distant from them as heaven is from earth. What makes them representatives of the petit bourgeoisie is that in their thinking they are unable to cross the boundaries that the life of the petit bourgeois never crosses and therefore they theoretically arrive at the same tasks and decisions to which the petit bourgeois is virtually led by his material interests and his social position" (F. Engels and K. Marx, "Soch." [Works], vol 8, p 148).

As the CPCZ Central Committee document, "The Causes of the Crisis Development in the CPCZ After the 13th CPCZ Congress" says: "Numerous facts confirm that in our country in 1968 a broad anticommunist coalition was formed and a new political system was formulated which was in fact reviving the situation that existed prior to February 1948 and in which even the elements of the pre-Munich bourgeois republic distinctly manifested themselves. At that time, when the CPCZ was demoralized by the right-wing opportunists and its activity and fighting ability were paralyzed, the petit bourgeois counterrevolution was building its ever growing reserves and threw them into the political struggle as it deemed necessary. The right-wing opportunist faction of the CPCZ leadership considered this antisocialist movement a positive political activity of our citizens. And in this connection, all those who spoke out against the aforementioned dangerous phenomena were labeled by the right-wing elements as sectarianist and conservative opponents of 'socialist renaissance.' In reality, the right-wing opportunist leaders opened the door for clearly reactionary and counterrevolutionary elements that were pushing forward and did not try to conceal their intention to remove A. Dubcek, O. Cernik and others from power as soon as they were no longer needed for the defense and protection of the latter."

And further on: "Under the pretext of the need to meet the consumer halfway, the right-wing elements were securing private entrepreneurship and striving to ensure that the petit bourgeois elements would achieve their own economic base in order to corrupt socialism. Today, O. Sik himself and his friends in the West openly admit the counterrevolutionary plans in the sphere of the national economy."

"Thus, theoretical and practical preparations were gradually made for the stages of transformation of the socialist economy into a system that would deprive the workers class not only of all its revolutionary achievements but also of basic political and economic guarantees. The right-wing elements calculated that a gradual deterioration of the economic situation would provoke uncontrolled discontent among the Czechoslovak working people which they would then use in the struggle against the socialist authority."

The following fact can be also cited to illustrate the way the author wrenches individual statements out of Lenin's works and on their basis draws conclusions that clearly contradict the course of Lenin's thinking: On the basis of Lenin's remarks that the multitude of small merchants in the early years of the New Economic Policy and their lively activity did not all mark them as a great economic power, Ye. A. Ambartsumov concludes: "The experience of many socialist countries in successfully overcoming 'bottlenecks' in the economy by reviving the small-ownership activities of certain groups confirms Lenin's forecast and refutes the groundless misgivings of adherents to projects that are correct in theory but, in Lenin's words, "unsound in practice" (pp 24-25). The artificiality and scientifically unfounded nature of this type of interpretation of Lenin's remarks about specific conditions in the Soviet republic in 1922 and their application to the socialist states of our time are obvious to everyone who adheres to Marxist-Leninist methodology. Here Ye. A. Ambartsumov clearly idealizes small-ownership activity, which must be judged not only by its immediate economic effect but also by its effect on social relations and morals and the socialist way of life. He cannot fail to

be aware that this effect is not always, to put it mildly, of the same type and that it manifests itself, at times, in direct conflict with the formation of the socialist collectivism, is connected with an undesirable and often unjust redistribution of returns from work and engenders an inequality that is not in accord with socialist principles. By the way, let it be said that in citing the aforementioned observations of Lenin, Ye. A. Ambartsumov does not include the following passage from the second version of an interview given by Lenin to a correspondent of the MANCHESTER GUARDIAN (incidentally, the only one that Lenin himself singled out in the text by putting it in italics) since it does not fit into his scheme of things: "The true essence of the New Economic Policy lies in the fact that the proletarian state, first, allowed freedom of trading for small producers and, second, in the fact that the proletarian state applies to big capital's means of production a whole series of principles of what has been called 'state capitalism' in the capitalist economy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 45, p 266). As regards the author's attack on the "purity of projects that are correct in theory but...unsound in practice," he gives rise to bewilderment, to say the least. Statements Lenin made on specific occasions should not be turned against good theory in general. This is not the path a scientist should follow.

Many other vulnerable passages in the article could be cited in this connection. Here and there throughout the article reservations are made about the opposing interests of the working masses and directors, the elimination of which is shown as the main task of the trade unions and about the struggle against bureaucratism, which Lenin supposedly placed, under the conditions of the New Economic Policy, at the center of attention of the party and the workers class (p 27). "...Lenin harbored no illusions," the author claims, "about the possibility of a very early liquidation of the bureaucracy as a social professional group" (ibid.), as though the caste of bureaucrats had not been annihilated during the process of breaking up the bourgeois state machinery. Of course, the new administrative apparatus formed from among workers, peasants and soldiers was also subject to the contagion of bureaucratization, a contagion from the remaining old functionaries.

And Lenin saw this danger just as he saw the measures of the struggle against it: drawing new forces from among leading workers, the replacement of bureaucratized and conceited leaders, widely public work, criticism and self-criticism. And the main tasks on which the party and workers class concentrated their efforts in those years were the struggle against hunger and devastation, the salvation of the workers class and the advancement of agriculture and small industry to create the conditions for the country's electrification and industrialization.

The article's methods of quoting sources are original. On page 20, Ye. A. Ambartsumov cites the following excerpt: "The need for equalization (in the consumption by rank-and-file workers and responsible workers--Ye. A.), it was noted at the 10th Party Congress, runs as a red thread through all decisions and resolutions of nonparty speakers at any workers' rally" (the reference in the footnote: The 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party [of Bolsheviks], March 1921, Stenographic Report, Moscow, 1963, p 291). The quoted passage from a speech by A. Lozovskiy (S. A. Dridzo) in fact reads as follows: "During the war, we created for the purpose of rations--I am not



referring to the privileges of the 'top levels'--no fewer than 30 different categories among the workers themselves: the highest shock workers, the semi-shock workers and so forth. All this was tolerated, but following the war, it had its effects. You come across demands for equalization in all enterprises, demands running like a red thread through all decisions and statements of nonparty speakers at any workers' rally" (source is the same and italics in both cases are mine--Ye. B.). The explanation provided by Ye. A. Ambartsumov in parentheses, to put it mildly, qualitatively changes what A. Lozovskiy said.

On the same page, Ye. A. Ambartsumov cites two phrases from the resolution of the nonparty conference of metal workers (Moscow, 2-4 February 1921) on the abolition of "all types of rations, including both the privileged ones and all others" and on the need to "introduce equalized distribution of products that would be the same for all working people" (the words in quotation marks are from the newspaper KOMMUNISTICHESKIY TRUD, No 262, 5 February 1921. In the book "Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party [of Bolsheviks]..." p 877). However, a most important circumstance has been omitted in this connection. As it is stated in the notes to the stenographic report on the 10th Congress, V. I. Lenin delivered a speech at the final conference session on 4 February on the mutual relations between workers and peasants ("Soch." Fourth Edition, vol 32, pp 87-90. "Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 42, pp 306-309--Ye. B.). Lenin's speech was received with applause and sharply changed the mood of the conference. The resolution entitled "ON REPLACING THE [Surplus] APPORTIONMENT WITH DEFINITE TAX IN NATURAL GOODS" (ibid; italics are mine--Ye. B.) on the attitude of the workers class toward the peasantry was adopted.

This additional information is passed over in silence because the fact that such a resolution was adopted after Lenin's speech prior to the Kronshtadt mutiny and prior to the 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) does not fall within the scheme of the author which, in turn, is not in accord with the concrete historical analysis of events of that period. Of course, the author must know that, as early as November 1920, Lenin prepared a draft decision of the Council of People's Commissars on direct taxes. The first paragraph of the draft says: "One--instruct the Commission to additionally review within a week the question:

"...second, of the need to simultaneously prepare and carry out both the abolition of monetary taxes and the transformation of the surplus apportionment into taxes in kind" (vol 42, p 51).

This draft was adopted by the Council of People's Commissars on 30 November 1920. On 14 December, the draft law of the Council of People's Commissars on strengthening and developing agricultural production and on assisting the peasant economy was published in the press for general discussion (ibid. p 145).

At the 8 February 1921 session of the Central Committee Politburo of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) Lenin wrote the "Preliminary Rough Draft of Theses Regarding Peasants" the first point of view was: "To satisfy the wishes of nonparty peasants to replace the [surplus] apportionment (for the purpose of removing surpluses) with the grand tax" (ibid., p 383).

Developing this idea, the Central Committee Plenum of the Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) on 20 February approved the draft resolution on replacing the [surplus] apportionment by tax in kind (vol 43, p 433).

Everything that has been cited including the author's unintelligible passages about the policy of the Polish United Workers Party in the sphere of the trade union movement and other flaws are the result of a shallow approach to the study of Lenin's theoretical heritage and of the experience of the struggle for socialism in the fraternal socialist countries and the consequence of a relaxed exactingness on the part of the journal VOPROSY ISTORII's editorial office toward the preparation of responsible materials.

If Ye. A. Ambartsumov--specialist in sociopolitical history of the USSR and of other socialist countries, as the editorial office certifies--had provided some facts that were previously unknown, even if only single ones, and had built some type of broad generalization on such a shaky basis, the misfortune would be small. The mistake could be quickly dispelled by comparison with the totality of fact that characterize any particular phenomenon of social development in a given historical situation. What is bad is the fact that an author uses especially selective quotations of passages or even individual phrases--at times arbitrarily separated--from Lenin's works to develop his own concept, which is then attributed to Lenin. It would somehow be awkward then to argue with the author over anything. But what is involved here is a violation of the principles of Leninist methodology itself, pitting the letter taken out of context of the classical heritage against the basic meaning of that heritage, the improper use of facts and sources and inadequate methodological standards. None of this advances science or enriches knowledge but forces us to mark time to explain a question that has been comprehensively examined and solved long ago in both theory and social practice.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/2

## IMPERIALIST PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sep 84) pp 126-127

[Review by Major General Yu. Kirshin, doctor of philosophical sciences, of the book "Psikhologicheskaya Voyna. Podryvnyye Deystviya Imperializma v Oblasti Obschestvennogo Soznaniya" [Psychological Warfare. Subversive Imperialist Activities in the Area of Social Consciousness] by D. A. Volkogonov. Voenizdat, Moscow, 1983, 288 pp]

[Text] The new book by Lieutenant General, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Prof D. A. Volkogonov describes the class foundations, nature, objectives and means of imperialist psychological warfare and the nature of its psychological subversions. As the offspring of imperialism, psychological warfare is a system of subversive ideological influences aimed not only and merely at the area of theoretical awareness but at the ordinary consciousness of the people. In the course of this "war," the imperialist propaganda services try to instill in the public and individual consciousness of the citizen of the socialist society ideas and views alien to him, to weaken the international unity among the fraternal socialist countries and to replace the communist ideals and convictions and the socialist way of life with Western "values": individualism, private ownership mentality and nationalism.

The author describes in detail the strategy and tactics of psychological warfare. The strategy is based on long-range concepts of the overall political course and domestic and foreign policy, which also determine the nature of psychological warfare tactics. Characteristic of such tactics are selected influences and concentration of efforts on one target, area or social group or another and the restructuring of arguments depending on changes in the circumstances and the application of the various forms and methods consistent with the new ideological situation. Anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, a militaristic trend, a misrepresentation of the problem of war and peace, the absolutizing of the power component in politics and allowing the possibility of limited or protracted nuclear war are features of contemporary psychological warfare strategy.

The reader will unquestionably be interested in the study of the mechanism of waging psychological warfare, based on manipulating the consciousness of the masses and introducing purposeful disinformation within it. The manipulation



includes methods such as providing at the proper time a frequently coarsely fabricated version of events, deliberate concealment of the truth and providing an excessive amount of information which prevents a person from understanding the nature of events by himself. As an important element in psychological warfare, disinformation is reduced to reports in versions the purpose of which is deliberately to mislead people and to instill in them a false concept of reality. A particular role is played in disinformation by sensationalism, stereotypes, images, etc. The author exposes not only the general methods and means of psychological warfare (forging, discrediting, blocking, frightening, starting rumors) but also their "specialized" variants (war demonstrations, acts of terrorism and subversion, diplomatic steps, economic sabotage, trade blockades, espionage actions, etc.).

Using extensive factual data, the author considers the means of waging psychological warfare, such as radio, the press and television as instruments of disinformation and manipulation of public consciousness. The book deals extensively with the study of the complex widespread structure and content of the work of imperialist propaganda centers and organs, which organize and coordinate subversive ideological and psychological operations against socialism and other revolutionary forces of our time. This applies to the USIA, the British Council, the Central Information Bureau and the BBC, and the FRG Federal Press and Information Department.

The state psychological warfare bodies have extensive possibilities of engaging in subversive activities. Operating within them are a large number of so-called Sovietologists--professional anti-Soviets and specialists in subversive activities against the USSR.

The author describes in detail also the activities of "public" psychological subversion centers which exist in a great variety of forms (associations, councils, institutes, foundations, corporations, commissions, etc.) and are financed and directed by the special services of the imperialist countries and by monopoly capitalism.

The special and intelligence services in the NATO countries, in the United States in particular, are assigned important functions in waging psychological warfare. They actively participate in the preparations for and unleashing aggressive local wars. They interfere in the domestic affairs of sovereign countries and carry out strategic and tactical psychological operations. The NATO leadership considers such operations an important separate means of spiritual and moral influence on the enemy armed forces and population, with a view to assisting the implementation of tasks in the armed struggle.

It follows from the aggravated ideological confrontation between socialism and capitalism and the uninterrupted psychological warfare waged by imperialism against real socialism that, as was pointed out at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, we must develop the political vigilance of the Soviet people and their intolerance of hostile views. The ability to counter enemy diversionary actions in the spiritual area and to engage in an aggressive struggle against them are developed by actively shaping and asserting a communist outlook. The Soviet person, patriot and internationalist, is deeply aware of the basic class conflict between the ideals of the socialist and the

bourgeois worlds. He is convinced of the superiority of socialism over capitalism in all realms of social life and is irreconcilable toward the enemies of our homeland, bourgeois ideology, racism, chauvinism and nationalism.

The June Plenum noted that in ideological work it is extremely important to maintain conceptual clarity and methodological discipline. They are of topical significance in the ideological struggle and in organizing and carrying out counterpropaganda activities. The observance of conceptual accuracy and methodological discipline in the ideological confrontation presumes a class-oriented assessment of the ideological situation, defense of the purity of Marxism-Leninism and exposure of the class roots of bourgeois concepts and theories and the reactionary trends in bourgeois ideology.

The aggravation of the ideological confrontation in the world arena and the uninterrupted psychological warfare waged by imperialism on real socialism raise a number of theoretically and practically important problems. As we pointed out, this means paying greater attention to developing in the Soviet people political vigilance and enhancing their ideological tempering and intolerance of hostile views. In order to upgrade the efficiency of the ideological struggle a more profound study must be made of the contents, forms and methods of imperialist propaganda. The skills of ideological workers in the area of counterpropaganda must be enhanced. A great deal remains to be done also in the further development of topical problems of the ideological struggle.

In recent years our publishing houses have begun to put out more books on the ideological struggle and criticism of bourgeois ideology. The work of D. A. Volkogonov will assume its position among them as a substantiated exposure of the mechanism and methods of contemporary imperialist psychological warfare.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2

## BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 14, Sep 84 (signed to press 28 Sept 84) p 128

[Text] 1. Lenin, V. I. "Izbrannyye Sochineniya" [Selected Works]. In 10 volumes. Volume 1, 1894-1900. CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 569 pp with one photograph.

2. "Lenin." Years of the Great Prologue, 1905-1907. G. S. Usyskin compiler and preface author. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 430 pp with illustrations.

3. Chernenko, K. U. "Utverzhdai' Pravdu Zhizni, Vysokiye Idealy Sotsializma" [Asserting the Truth of Life and the Lofty Ideals of Socialism]. Speech at the anniversary plenum of the board of the Union of the USSR Writers, delivered on 25 September 1984. V. A. Pechenev and V. V. Pribytkov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 15 pp.

4. "Razvitoy Sotsializm" [Developed Socialism]. Collections of documents and materials. Compiled by Yu. M. Khrustalev and L. N. Laponkina. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 560 pp.

5. "Za Mir i Bezopasnost' Narodov" [For Peace and the Security of Nations]. USSR foreign policy documents. 1967. In two volumes. Volume 1. January-June. Volume 2. July-December. USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Commission in Charge of Publication of Diplomatic Documents of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A. A. Gromyko commission chairman. Editorial collegium: A. V. Grishin et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984. Volume 1, 335 pp; volume 2, 413 pp.

6. "Spravochnyy Tom k Vos'momu Izdaniyu 'KPPS v Rezolyutsiyakh i Resheniyakh S'yezdov, Konferentsiy i Plenumov Task'" [Reference Volume for the Eighth Edition of "The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses and Conferences and Central Committee Plenums"]. Second expanded edition. CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism. A. G. Yegorov and K. M. Bogolyubov, general editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 415 pp.

7. "Spravochnik Partiynogo Rabotnika" [Party Worker's Manual]. No 24. In two parts. Part II. Editorial collegium: K. M. Bogolyubov et al. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 365 pp.



8. "Aktual'nyye Problemy Mezhdunarodnoy Bezopasnosti i Razoruzheniya" [Topical Problems of International Security and Disarmament]. Scientific Council for the Study of Problems of Peace and Disarmament. Soviet Peace Foundation. Editorial collegium: V. S. Shaposhnikov [editor in chief] et al. Progress, Moscow, 1984, 502 pp.

9. Artemov, V. I. "Pravda o Nepravde" [The Truth About Untruth]. Critical essays on contemporary imperialist anti-Soviet propaganda. Second revised and expanded edition. Politizdat, 1984, 270 pp with illustrations.

10. Bezymenskiy, L. A. "Razgadannyye Zagadki Tret'yego Reykha" [Unraveled Puzzles of the Third Reich]. A book not exclusively about the past. In two volumes. Volume 1. 1933-1941; Volume 2. 1941-1945. APN Press, Moscow, 1984. Volume 1, 368 pp with illustrations; Volume 2, 400 pp with illustrations.

11. "Istoriya Kommunisticheskoy Partii Kanady, 1921-1976" [History of the Canadian Communist Party, 1921-1976]. Translated from the English. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 279 pp with illustrations.

12. Kamenetskiy, Ye. I. "Doveriye k Slovu" [Trust in the World]. Statements by party workers and journalists. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 283 pp.

13. "Kratkiy Pedagogicheskiy Slovar' Propagandista" [A Short Pedagogical Dictionary for the Propagandist]. Compiled by M. N. Kolmakova and V. S. Surov. M. I. Kondakov and A. S. Vishnyakov general editors. Politizdat, 1984, 319 pp.

14. "Kritika Fal'sifikatsiy Natsional'nykh Otnosheniy v SSSR" [Critique of the Misrepresentation of National Relations in the USSR]. CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism. Editorial collegium: M. P. Mchedlov (responsible editor) et al. M. I. Kulichenko, head of the group of authors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 496 pp.

15. Kubasov, V. N. "Prikosnoveniye Kosmosa" [Contact with Space]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 176 pp with illustrations.

16. Smirtyukov, M. S. "Sovetskiy Gosudarstvennyy Apparat Upravleniya" [The Soviet State Administration Machinery]. Problems of the organization and activities of the central authorities. Second revised and enlarged edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 287 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/2

**INDEX TO KOMMUNIST, NO. 14, SEPTEMBER 1984**

[The following index, compiled by JPRS, is provided as a service to its consumers.]

**A**

**Agriculture**

loss of population, 33

**Ambartsumov, Ye. A.**

article on crises in socialism, 145

**Arms race, 104**

abandonment of detente, 97

U.S. missiles in Europe, 72

U.S. participation, 10, 71

**C**

**Capitalism**

conservatism in capitalist countries, 90, 93

economic competition, 43

economic upswing in Japan and U.S., 85

marginal population, 88

psychological warfare, 158

structural crisis, 85

**CEMA**

economic conference, 83

USSR-GDR economic cooperation, 74

**Cheka, 56**

Menzhinskiy, V. R., 52, 56

Reilly, S., 60

Savinkov, B., 60

**Chernenko, K. U.**

address to Finland, 12

Book of Speeches and Articles, 10

speech to USSR Writers' Union, Sep 1984, 1, 162

**D**

Dzerzhinskiy, F. E., 57

**E**

**Economy, domestic**

demographics, 33

development of Siberia and Far East, 34

economic experiment, 36

export potential, 41

labor discipline, 37

manpower, 28

marketing and technical servicing, 49

mechanization of industry, 35

New Economic Policy, 150  
Siberia, 34  
spare parts, 50  
European Economic Community  
unemployment in, 88

## F

Fedoseyev, P. N.  
book "Philosophy and Scientific Knowledge", 120  
Finland, 12  
Foreign trade  
export potential, 41  
manufacture of tropical goods, 47  
purchase and sale of licenses, 48  
FRG  
Federal Press and Information Department, 159  
neo-Nazism in, 94

## G

GDR, 64  
CEMA participation, 70  
cooperation with USSR, 70  
industrial successes, 65  
Marxist-Leninist ideology, 67  
relations with West Germany, 73  
standard of living in, 68  
Gromyko, A. A.  
arms race, 116  
book "Leninist Peace Course," 110  
contributions, 111  
foreign policy, 112  
peace and detente, 115, 116  
revolution and counterrevolution, 115

## H

Honecker, Erich  
EINHEIT article text, Nos 9-10, 1984, 64

## I

Ideology  
crises in socialism, 145  
Fedoseyev book, 120  
Gromyko book, 110  
Il'ichev book, 129  
liberal populists, 15  
literature, 1  
Marxism-Leninism's international success, 122  
Narodniki [Populists], criticism of, 14  
socialism vs. capitalism, 159  
Il'ichev, L. F.  
book "Historical Materialism", 129



## K

Kronshtadt mutiny, 148

## L

Lenin, V. I.

"Friends of the People",

## M

Menzhinskiy, V. R.

biography, 52

Cheka head, 56

Mikhaylovskiy, N. K.

liberal populists, 14

Mitin, M.

review of "Sociologist's Work Book", 142

Multinational corporations, 87

## N

NATO countries

intelligence services, 159

psychological warfare, 159

New Economic Policy, 150

Northern Worker Alliance, 53

## P

Portugal, 10

## R

Reilly, S.

entrapment by Cheka, 60

## S

Savinkov, B.

entrapment by Cheka, 60

## U

United States

budget cuts, 105

defense industry profits, 104

discrimination, 102

family breakdown, 107

farm income drop, 108

imperialist acts, 118

interest rate increase, 108

lowering of wages, 103

military-industrial complex, 106

poverty, 104, 107

profits, 104

proposed tax plan, 106

turn to the right, 108

unemployment, 101

USIA, 159  
US-USSR relations  
    human rights campaign of U.S., 100  
    imperialism of U.S., 110  
    Jimmy Carter, 100  
    propaganda campaign, 100

V  
Volkogonov, D. A.  
    book "Psychological Warfare", 158

W  
Writers' Union  
    first all-union congress, 1

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

25 Jan 1985